A 000 145 852 0
UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY

rnia
al

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/worksofrevsydney02smitiala

THE WORKS

OF

THE REV. SYDNEY SMITH.

VOLUME II.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY SPOTTISWOODE AND CO.
NEW-STREET SQUARE.

THE WORKS

OF

THE REV. SYDNEY SMITH

INCLUDING HIS CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE EDINBURGH REVIEW.

IN TWO VOLS.

VOLUME THE SECOND.

LONDON
LONGMAN, BROWN, GREEN, LONGMANS, AND ROBERTS.
1859

PR
5455
A2
1859

CONTENTS

OF

THE SECOND VOLUME.

ARTICLES ORIGINALLY PUBLISHED IN THE "EDINBURGH REVIEW."

	Page
Persecuting Bishops	1
Botany Bay	12
Game Laws	25
Cruel Treatment of Untried Prisoners	32
America	42
Memoirs of Captain Rock	52
Bentham on Fallacies	59
Waterton	74
Granby	84
Hamilton's Method of teaching Languages	92
Counsel for Prisoners	106
Catholics	120
Peter Plymley's Letters	135
The Judge that smites contrary to the Law: a Sermon	184
The Lawyer that tempted Christ: a Sermon	190

SPEECHES.

Speech at a Meeting of the Clergy of Cleveland	197
Speech on the Catholic Claims	201
Speech at the Taunton Reform Meeting	207
Speech at Taunton at a Meeting to celebrate the Accession of King William IV.	212
Speech at Taunton in 1831 on the Reform Bill not being passed	214
Speech respecting the Reform Bill	215
A Letter to the Electors upon the Catholic Question	223
A Sermon on the Rules of Christian Charity	242
Sermon on the Duties of the Queen	249

Page

A Prayer 254
First Letter to Archdeacon Singleton 255
Second ditto 275
Third ditto 287
Letter to Lord John Russell 297
Letter on the Character of Sir James Mackintosh . . . 302
The Ballot 305
Letter to Mr. Horner 319

Letters on Railways:—
"Locking in" on Railways 321
"Locking in" on Railways 323
Burning alive on Railroads 325

Letters on American Debts:—
The Humble Petition of the Rev. Sydney Smith to the House of Congress at Washington 326
Letter I. 327
Letter II. 330

Modern Changes 332
A Fragment on the Irish Roman Catholic Church . . . 333

Index 343

ARTICLES

ORIGINALLY PUBLISHED IN

THE EDINBURGH REVIEW.

PERSECUTING BISHOPS.

(E. Review, 1822.)

1. *An Appeal to the Legislature and Public; or, the Legality of the Eighty-Seven Questions proposed by Dr. Herbert Marsh, the Bishop of Peterborough, to Candidates for Holy Orders, and for Licences, within that Diocese, considered.* 2nd Edition. London, Seeley, 1821.
2. *A Speech, delivered in the House of Lords, on Friday, June 7, 1822, by Herbert, Lord Bishop of Peterborough, on the Presentation of a Petition against his Examination Questions; with Explanatory Notes, a Supplement, and a Copy of the Questions.* London, Rivington, 1822.
3. *The Wrongs of the Clergy of the Diocese of Peterborough stated and illustrated.* By the Rev. T. S. Grimshawe, M.A., Rector of Burton, Northamptonshire; and Vicar of Biddenham, Bedfordshire. London, Seeley, 1822.
4. *Episcopal Innovation; or, the Test of Modern Orthodoxy, in Eighty-Seven Questions, imposed, as Articles of Faith, upon Candidates for Licences and for Holy Orders, in the Diocese of Peterborough; with a Distinct Answer to each Question, and General Reflections relative to their Illegal Structure and Pernicious Tendency.* London, Seeley, 1820.
5. *Official Correspondence between the Right Reverend Herbert, Lord Bishop of Peterborough, and the Rev. John Green, respecting his Nomination, to the Curacy of Blatherwycke, in the Diocese of Peterborough, and County of Northampton: Also, between His Grace Charles, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Rev. Henry William Neville, M.A., Rector of Blatherwycke, and of Cottesmore in the County of Rutland.* 1821.

It is a great point in any question to clear away encumbrances, and to make a naked circle about the object in dispute, so that there may be a clear view of it on every side. In pursuance of this disencumbering process, we shall first acquit the Bishop of all wrong intentions. He has a very bad opinion of the practical effects of high Calvinistic doctrines upon the common people; and he thinks it his duty to exclude those clergymen who profess them from his diocese. There is no moral wrong in this. He has accordingly devised no fewer than *eighty-seven* interrogatories, by which he thinks he can detect the smallest taint of Calvinism that may lurk in the creed of the candidate; and in this also, whatever we may think of his reasoning, we suppose his purpose to be blameless. He believes, finally, that he has legally the power so to interrogate and exclude; and in this, perhaps, he is not mistaken. His intentions, then, are good, and his conduct, perhaps, not amenable to the law. All this we admit in his favour: but against him we must maintain, that his conduct upon the points in dispute has been singularly injudicious, extremely harsh, and, in its effects (though not in its intentions), very oppressive and vexatious to the Clergy.

We have no sort of intention to avail ourselves of an anonymous publication to say unkind, uncivil, or disrespectful things to a man of rank, learning, and character — we hope to be guilty of no such impropriety; but we cannot believe we are doing wrong in ranging ourselves on the weaker side, in the

cause of propriety and justice. The Mitre protects its wearer from indignity; but it does not secure impunity.

It is a strong presumption that a man is wrong, when all his friends, whose habits naturally lead them to coincide with him, think him wrong. If a man were to indulge in taking medicine till the apothecary, the druggist, and the physician, all called upon him to abandon his philocathartic propensities — if he were to gratify his convivial habits till the landlord demurred, and the waiter shook his head — we should naturally imagine that advice so wholly disinterested was not given before it was wanted, and that it merited some little attention and respect. Now, though the Bench of Bishops certainly love power, and love the Church, as well as the Bishop of Peterborough, yet not one defended him — not one rose to say, "I have done, or I would do, the same thing." It was impossible to be present at the last debate on this question, without perceiving that his Lordship stood alone — and this in a very gregarious profession, that habitually combines and butts against an opponent with a very extended front. If a lawyer is wounded, the rest of the profession pursue him, and put him to death. If a churchman is hurt, the others gather round for his protection, stamp with their feet, push with their horns, and demolish the dissenter who did the mischief.

The Bishop has at least done a very unusual thing in his Eighty-seven Questions. The two Archbishops, and we believe every other Bishop, and all the Irish hierarchy, admit curates into their dioceses without any such precautions. The necessity of such severe and scrupulous inquisition, in short, has been apparent to nobody but the Bishop of Peterborough; and the authorities by which he seeks to justify it are anything but satisfactory. His Lordship states, that forty years ago he was himself examined by written interrogatories, and that he is not the only Bishop who has done it; but he mentions no names; and it was hardly worth while to state such extremely slight precedents for so strong a deviation from the common practice of the Church.

The Bishop who rejects a curate upon the Eighty-seven Questions is necessarily and inevitably opposed to the Bishop who ordained him. The Bishop of Gloucester ordains a young man of twenty-three years of age, not thinking it necessary to put to him these interrogatories, or putting them, perhaps, and approving of answers diametrically opposite to those that are required by the Bishop of Peterborough. The young clergyman then comes to the last-mentioned Bishop; and the Bishop, after *putting him to the Question*, says, "You are unfit for a clergyman," — though, ten days before, the Bishop of Gloucester has made him one! It is bad enough for ladies to pull caps, but still worse for Bishops to pull mitres. Nothing can be more mischievous or indecent than such scenes; and no man of common prudence, or knowledge of the world, but must see that they ought immediately to be put a stop to. If a man is a captain in the army in one part of England, he is a captain in all. The general who commands north of the Tweed does not say, You shall never appear in my district, or exercise the functions of an officer, if you do not answer eighty-seven questions on the art of war, according to my notions. The same officer who commands a ship of the line in the Mediterranean, is considered as equal to the same office in the North Seas. The sixth commandment is suspended, by one medical diploma, from the north of England to the south. But, by this new system of interrogation, a man may be admitted into orders at Barnet, rejected at Stevenage, readmitted at Brogden, kicked out as a Calvinist at Witham Common, and hailed as an ardent Armenian on his arrival at York.

It matters nothing to say that sacred things must not be compared with profane. In their importance, we allow, they cannot; but in their order and discipline they may be so far compared as to say, that the discrepancy and contention which would be disgraceful and pernicious in worldly affairs, should,

in common prudence be avoided in the affairs of religion. Mr. Greenough has made a map of England, according to its geological varieties; — blue for the chalk, green for the clay, red for the sand, and so forth. Under this system of Bishop Marsh, we must petition for the assistance of the geologist in the fabrication of an ecclesiastical map. All the Arminian districts must be purple. Green for one theological extremity — sky-blue for another — as many colours as there are Bishops — as many shades of these colours as there are Archdeacons — a tailor's pattern card — the picture of vanity, fashion, and caprice.

The Bishop seems surprised at the resistance he meets with; and yet, to what purpose has he read ecclesiastical history, if he expect to meet with anything but the most determined opposition? Does he think that every sturdy supralapsarian bullock whom he tries to sacrifice to the Genius of Orthodoxy, will not kick, and push, and toss; that he will not, if he *can*, shake the axe from his neck, and hurl his mitred butcher into the air? His Lordship has undertaken a task of which he little knows the labour or the end. We know these men fully as well as the Bishop; he has not a chance of success against them. If one motion in Parliament will not do, they will have twenty. They will ravage, roar, and rush, till the very chaplains, and the Masters and Misses Peterborough request his Lordship to desist. He is raising up a storm in the English Church of which he has not the slightest conception; and which will end, as it ought to end, in his Lordship's disgrace and defeat.

The longer we live, the more we are convinced of the justice of the old saying, that an *ounce of mother wit is worth a pound of clergy*; that discretion, gentle manners, common sense, and good nature, are, in men of high ecclesiastical station, of far greater importance than the greatest skill in discriminating between sublapsarian and supralapsarian doctrines. Bishop Marsh should remember, that all men wearing the mitre work by character, as well as doctrine; that a tender regard to men's rights and feelings, a desire to avoid sacred squabbles, a fondness for quiet, and an ardent wish to make everybody happy, would be of far more value to the Church of England than all his learning and vigilance of inquisition. The Irish Tithes will probably fall next session of Parliament; the common people are regularly receding from the Church of England —baptizing, burying, and confirming for themselves. Under such circumstances, what would the worst enemy of the English Church require? — a bitter, bustling, theological Bishop, accused by his clergy of tyranny and oppression — the cause of daily petitions and daily debates in the House of Commons — the idoneous vehicle of abuse against the Establishment — a stalking-horse to bad men for the introduction of revolutionary opinions, mischievous ridicule, and irreligious feelings. Such will be the advantages which Bishop Marsh will secure for the English Establishment in the ensuing session. It is inconceivable how such a prelate shakes all the upper works of the Church, and ripens it for dissolution and decay. Six such Bishops, multiplied by eighty-seven, and working with five hundred and twenty-two questions, would fetch everything to the ground in less than six months. But what if it pleased Divine Providence to afflict every prelate with the spirit of putting eighty-seven queries, and the two Archbishops with the spirit of putting twice as many, and the Bishop of Sodor and Man with the spirit of putting only forty-three queries? — there would then be a grand total of two thousand three hundred and thirty-five interrogations flying about the English Church; and sorely vexed would the land be with Question and Answer.

We will suppose this learned Prelate, without meanness or undue regard to his worldly interests, to feel that fair desire of rising in his profession, which any man, in any profession, may feel without disgrace. Does he forget that his character in the ministerial circles will soon become that of a violent impracticable man — whom it is impos-

sible to place in the highest situations—who has been trusted with too much already, and must be trusted with no more? Ministers have something else to do with their time, and with the time of Parliament, than to waste them in debating squabbles between Bishops and their Clergy. They naturally wish, and, on the whole, reasonably expect, that everything should go on silently and quietly in the Church. They have no objection to a learned Bishop; but they deprecate one atom more of learning than is compatible with moderation, good sense, and the soundest discretion. It must be the grossest ignorance of the world to suppose that the Cabinet has any pleasure in watching Calvinists.

The Bishop not only puts the questions, but he actually assigns the limits within which they are to be answered. Spaces are left in the paper of interrogations, to which limits the answer is to be confined;—two inches to original sin: an inch and a half to justification; three quarters to predestination; and to free will only a quarter of an inch. But if his Lordship gives them an inch, they will take an ell. His Lordship is himself a theological writer, and by no means remarkable for his conciseness. To deny space to his brother theologians, who are writing on the most difficult subjects, not from choice, but necessity; not for fame, but for bread; and to award rejection as the penalty of prolixity, does appear to us no slight deviation from Christian gentleness. The tyranny of calling for such short answers is very strikingly pointed out in a letter from Mr. Thurtell to the Bishop of Peterborough; the style of which pleads, we think, very powerfully in favour of the writer.

"*Beccles, Suffolk, August 28th*, 1821.

"My Lord,

"I ought, in the first place, to apologise for delaying so long to answer your Lordship's letter: but the difficulty in which I was involved, by receiving another copy of your Lordship's Questions, with positive directions to give short answers, may be sufficient to account for that delay.

"It is my sincere desire to meet your Lordship's wishes, and to obey your Lordship's directions in every particular; and I would therefore immediately have returned answers, without any 'restrictions or modifications,' to the Questions which your Lordship has thought fit to send me, if, in so doing, I could have discharged the obligations of my conscience, by showing what my opinions really are. But it appears to me, that the Questions proposed to me by your Lordship are so constructed as to elicit only two sets of opinions; and that, by answering them in so concise a manner, I should be representing myself to your Lordship as one who believes in either of two particular creeds, to neither of which I do *really* subscribe. For instance, to answer Question I. chap. ii. in the manner your Lordship desires, I am reduced to the alternative of declaring, either that 'mankind are a mass of *mere* corruption,' which expresses more than I intend, or of leaving room for the inference, that they are only *partially* corrupt, which is opposed to the plainest declarations of the Homilies; such as these, 'Man is *altogether* spotted and defiled' (Hom. on Nat.), 'without a *spark* of goodness in him' (Serm. on Mis. of Man, &c.).

"Again, by answering the Questions comprised in the chapter on 'Free Will,' according to your Lordship's directions, I am compelled to acknowledge, either that man has such a share in the work of his own salvation as to exclude the *sole* agency of God, or that he has no share whatever; when the Homilies for Rogation Week and Whitsunday positively declare, that God is the 'only Worker,' or, in other words, *sole* Agent; and at the same time assign to man a certain share in the work of his own salvation. In short, I could, with your Lordship's permission, point out twenty Questions, involving doctrines of the utmost importance, which I am unable to answer, so as to convey my real sentiments, without more room for explanation than the printed sheet affords.

"In this view of the subject, therefore, and in the most deliberate exercise of my judgment, I deem it indispensable to my acting with that candour and truth with which it is my wish and duty to act, and with which I cannot but believe your Lordship desires I should act, to state my opinions in that language which expresses them most fully, plainly, and unreservedly. This I have endeavoured to do in the answers now in the possession of your Lordship. If any further explanation be required, I am most willing to give it, even to a minuteness of opinion beyond what the Articles require. At the same time, I would

humbly and respectfully appeal to your Lordship's candour, *whether it is not hard to demand my decided opinion upon points which have been the themes of volumes; upon which the most pious and learned men of the Church have conscientiously differed; and upon which the Articles, in the judgment of Bishop Burnet, have pronounced no definite sentence.* To those Articles, my Lord, I have already subscribed; and I am willing again to subscribe to every one of them, 'in its literal and grammatical sense,' according to His Majesty's declaration prefixed to them.

"I hope, therefore, in consideration of the above statement, that your Lordship will not compel me, by the conciseness of my answers, to assent to doctrines which I do not believe, or to expose myself to inferences which do not fairly and legitimately follow from my opinions.

"I am, my Lord, &c. &c."

We are not much acquainted with the practices of courts of justice; but, if we remember right, when a man is going to be hanged, the judge lets him make his defence in his own way, without complaining of its length. We should think a Christian Bishop might be equally indulgent to a man who is going to be ruined. The answers are required to be clear, concise, and correct—short, plain, and positive. In other words, a poor curate, extremely agitated at the idea of losing his livelihood, is required to write with brevity and perspicuity on the following subjects:—Redemption by Jesus Christ—Original Sin—Free Will—Justification—Justification in reference to its Causes—Justification in reference to the time when it takes place—Everlasting Salvation—Predestination—Regeneration on the New Birth—Renovation, and the Holy Trinity. As a specimen of these questions, the answer to which is required to be so brief and clear, we shall insert the following quotation:—

"*Section II.—Of Justification, in reference to its cause.*

"1. Does not the eleventh Article declare, that we are 'justified by Faith *only*?'

"2. Does not the expression 'Faith only' derive additional strength from the negative expression in the same Article 'and *not* for our own works?'

"3. Does not therefore the eleventh Article *exclude* good works from all share in the office of Justifying? Or can we so construe the term 'Faith' in that Article, as to make it *include* good works?

"4. Do not the twelfth and thirteenth Articles *further* exclude them, the one by asserting that good works *follow after* Justification, the other by maintaining that they *cannot precede* it?

"5. Can that which never precedes an effect be reckoned among the *causes* of that effect?

"6. Can we then, consistently with our Articles, reckon the performance of good works among the *causes* of Justification, whatever qualifying epithet be used with the term *cause?*"

We entirely deny that the Calvinistical Clergy are bad members of their profession. We maintain that as many instances of good, serious, and pious men—of persons zealously interesting themselves in the temporal and spiritual welfare of their parishioners, are to be found among them, as among the clergy who put an opposite interpretation on the Articles. The Articles of Religion are older than Arminianism, *eo nomine*. The early Reformers leant to Calvinism; and would, to a man, have answered the Bishop's questions in a way which would have induced him to refuse them ordination and curacies; and those who drew up the Thirty-nine Articles, if they had not prudently avoided all precise interpretation of their Creed on free will, necessity, absolute decrees, original sin, reprobation, and election, would have, in all probability, given an interpretation of them like that which the Bishop considers as a disqualification for Holy Orders. Laud's Lambeth Articles were illegal, mischievous, and are generally condemned. The Irish Clergy in 1641 drew up one hundred and four articles as the creed of their Church; and these are Calvinistic and not Arminian. They were approved and signed by Usher, and never abjured by him; though dropt as a test or qualification. Usher was promoted (even in the days

of Arminianism) to bishoprics and archbishoprics—so little did a Calvinistic interpretation of the Articles in a man's own breast, or even an avowal of Calvinism beyond what was required by the Articles, operate even then as a disqualification for the cure of souls, or any other office in the Church. Throughout Charles II. and William III.'s time, the best men and greatest names of the Church not only allowed latitude in interpreting the Articles, but thought it would be wise to diminish their number, and render them more lax than they are; and be it observed that these latitudinarians leant to Arminianism rather than to high Calvinism; and thought, consequently, that the Articles, if objectionable at all, were exposed to the censure of being "too Calvinistic," rather than too Arminian. How preposterous, therefore, to twist them, and the subscription to them required by law, by the machinery of a long string of explanatory questions, into a barrier against Calvinists, and to give the Arminians a monopoly in the Church!

Archbishop Wake, in 1716, after consulting all the Bishops then attending Parliament, thought it incumbent on him "*to employ the authority which the ecclesiastical laws then in force, and the custom and laws of the realm vested in him*" in taking care that "*no unworthy person might hereafter be admitted into the sacred Ministry of the Church;*" and he drew up twelve recommendations to the Bishops of England, in which he earnestly exhorts them not to ordain persons of bad conduct or character, or incompetent learning; but he does not require from the candidates for Holy Orders or preferment any explanation whatever of the Articles which they had signed.

The Correspondence of the same eminent Prelate with Professor Turretin in 1718, and with Mr. Le Clerc and the Pastors and Professors of Geneva in 1719, printed in London, 1782, recommends union among Protestants, and the omission of controverted points in Confessions of Faith, as a means of obtaining that union; and a constant reference to the practice of the Church of England is made, in elucidation of the charity and wisdom of such policy. Speaking of men who act upon a contrary principle he says, *O quantum potuit insana φιλαντια!*

These passages, we think, are conclusive evidence of the practice of the Church till 1719. For Wake was not only at the time Archbishop of Canterbury, but both in his circular recommendations to the Bishops of England, and in his correspondence with foreign Churches, was acting in the capacity of metropolitan of the Anglican Church. He, a man of prudence and learning, publicly boasts to Protestant Europe, that his Church does *not* exact, and that he *de facto* has never avowed, and never will, his opinions on those very points upon which Bishop Marsh obliges every poor curate to be explicit, upon pain of expulsion from the Church.

It is clear, then, the practice was to extract subscription, and nothing else, as the test of orthodoxy—to that Wake is an evidence. As far as he is authority on a point of opinion, it is his conviction that this practice was wholesome, wise, and intended to preserve peace in the Church; that it would be wrong at least, if not illegal, to do otherwise; and that the observance of this forbearance is the only method of preventing schism. The Bishop of Peterborough, however, is of a different opinion; he is so thoroughly convinced of the pernicious effects of Calvinistic doctrines, that he does what no other Bishop does, or ever did do, for their exclusion. This may be either wise or injudicious, but it is at least zealous and bold; it is to encounter rebuke, and opposition, from a sense of duty. It is impossible to deny this merit to his Lordship. And we have no doubt, that, in pursuance of the same theological gallantry, he is preparing a set of interrogatories for those clergymen who are presented to benefices in his diocese. The patron will have his action of *Quare impedit*, it is true; and the judge and jury will decide whether the Bishop has the right of interrogation at all; and whether Calvinistical answers to his interrogatories disqualify any man from holding preferment in

the Church of England. If either of these points are given against the Bishop of Peterborough, he is in honour and conscience bound to give up his examination of curates. If Calvinistic ministers are, in the estimation of the Bishops, so dangerous as curates, they are, of course, much more dangerous as rectors and vicars. He has as much right to examine one as the other. Why, then, does he pass over the greater danger, and guard against the less? Why does he not show his zeal when he would run some risk, and where the excluded person (if excluded unjustly) could appeal to the laws of his country? If his conduct be just and right, has he anything to fear from that appeal? What should we say of a police officer, who acted in all cases of petty larceny, where no opposition was made, and let off all persons guilty of felony who threatened to knock him down? If the Bishop value his own character, he is bound to do less,—or to do more. God send his choice may be right! The law, as it stands at present, certainly affords very unequal protection to rector and to curate; but if the Bishop will not act so as to improve the law, the law must be so changed as to improve the Bishop; an action of *Quare impedit* must be given to the curate also—and then the fury of interrogation will be calmed.

We are aware that the Bishop of Peterborough, in his speech, disclaims the object of excluding the Calvinists by this system of interrogation. We shall take no other notice of his disavowal than expressing our sincere regret that he ever made it; but the question is not at all altered by the intention of the interrogator. Whether he aim at the Calvinists only, or includes them with other heterodox respondents —the fact is, they *are* included in the proscription, and excluded from the Church, the practical effect of the practice being that men are driven out of the Church who have as much right to exercise the duties of clergymen as the Bishop himself. If heterodox opinions are the great objects of the Bishop's apprehensions, he has his Ecclesiastical Courts, where regular process may bring the offender to punishment, and from whence there is an appeal to higher courts. This would be the fair thing to do. The curate and the Bishop would be brought into the light of day, and subjected to the wholesome restraint of public opinion.

His Lordship boasts that he has excluded only two curates. So the Emperor of Hayti boasted that he had only cut off two persons' heads for disagreeable behaviour at his table. In spite of the paucity of the visiters executed, the example operated as a considerable impediment to conversation; and the intensity of the punishment was found to be a full compensation for its rarity. How many persons have been deprived of curacies which they might have enjoyed but for the tenour of these interrogatories? How many respectable clergymen have been deprived of the assistance of curates connected with them by blood, friendship, or doctrine, and compelled to choose persons for no other qualification than that they could pass through the eye of the Bishop's needle? Violent measures are not to be judged of merely by the number of times they have been resorted to, but by the terror, misery, and restraint which the severity is likely to have produced.

We never met with any style so entirely clear of all redundant and vicious ornament as that which the ecclesiastical Lord of Peterborough has adopted towards his clergy. It, in fact, may be all reduced to these few words—"Reverend Sir, I shall do what I please. Peterborough."—Even in the House of Lords, he speaks what we must call very plain language. Among other things, he says that the allegations of the petitions are *false*. Now, as every Bishop is, besides his other qualities, a gentleman; and as the word *false* is used only by laymen who mean to hazard their lives by the expression; and as it cannot be supposed that foul language is ever used because it can be used with personal impunity, his Lordship must therefore be intended to mean not *false*, but *mistaken*—not a wilful deviation from truth, but an accidental and unintended departure from it.

His Lordship talks of the drudgery of wading through ten pages of answers to his eighty-seven questions. Who has occasioned this drudgery, but the person who means to be so much more active, useful, and important, than all other Bishops, by proposing questions which nobody has thought to be necessary but himself? But to be intolerably strict and harsh to a poor curate, who is trying to earn a morsel of hard bread, and then to complain of the drudgery of reading his answers, is much like knocking a man down with a bludgeon, and then abusing him for splashing you with his blood, and pestering you with his groans. It is quite monstrous, that a man who inflicts eighty-seven new questions in Theology upon his fellow-creatures, should talk of the drudgery of reading their answers.

A Curate—there is something which excites compassion in the very name of a Curate!!! How any man of Purple, Palaces, and Preferment, can let himself loose against this poor working man of God, we are at a loss to conceive,—a learned man in an hovel, with sermons and saucepans, lexicons and bacon, Hebrew books and ragged children—good and patient—a comforter and a preacher—the first and purest pauper in the hamlet, and yet showing, that, in the midst of his worldly misery, he has the heart of a gentleman, and the spirit of a Christian, and the kindness of a pastor; and this man, though he has exercised the duties of a clergyman for twenty years—though he has most ample testimonies of conduct from clergymen as respectable as any Bishop—though an Archbishop add his name to the list of witnesses, is not good enough for Bishop Marsh; but is pushed out in the street, with his wife and children, and his little furniture, to surrender his honour, his faith, his conscience, and his learning—or to starve!

An obvious objection to these innovations is, that there can be no end to them. If eighty-three questions are assumed to be necessary by one Bishop, eight hundred may be considered as the minimum of interrogation by another. When once the ancient faith-marks of the Church are lost sight of and despised, any misled theologian may launch out on the boundless sea of polemical vexation.

The Bishop of Peterborough is positive, that the Arminian interpretation of the Articles is the right interpretation, and that Calvinists should be excluded from it; but the country gentlemen who are to hear these matters debated in the Lower House, are to remember, that other Bishops have written upon these points before the Bishop of Peterborough, and have arrived at conclusions diametrically opposite. When curates are excluded because their answers are Calvinistical, a careless layman might imagine that this interpretation of the Articles had never been heard of before in the Church—that it was a gross and palpable perversion of their sense, which had been scouted by all writers on Church matters, from the day the Articles were promulgated, to this hour—that such an unheard-of monster as a Calvinistical Curate had never leapt over the pale before, and been detected browsing in the sacred pastures.

The following is the testimony of Bishop Sherlock:—

"'The Church has left a latitude of sense to prevent schisms and breaches upon every different opinion. It is evident the Church of England has so done in some Articles, which are most liable to the hottest disputes; which yet are penned with that temper as to be willingly subscribed by men of different apprehensions in those matters.'" — (SHERLOCK'*s Defence of Stillingfleet's Unreasonableness of Separation.*)

Bishop Cleaver, describing the difficulties attending so great an undertaking as the formation of a national creed, observes:—

"'These difficulties, however, do not seem to have discouraged the great leaders in this work from forming a design as wise as it was liberal, that of framing a confession, which in the enumeration and method of its several articles, should meet the approbation, and engage the consent of the whole reformed world.

"'If upon trial it was found that a comprehension so extensive could not be re-

duced to practice, still as large a comprehension as could be contrived, within the narrower limits of the kingdom, became, for the same reasons which first suggested the idea, at once an object of prudence and duty in the formation and government of the English Church.'

"After dwelling on the means necessary to accomplish this object, the Bishop proceeds to remark:—'Such evidently appears to have been the origin, and such the actual complexion of the confession comprised in the Articles of our Church; *the true scope and design of which will not, I conceive, be correctly apprehended in any other view than that of one drawn up and adjusted with an intention to comprehend the assent of all, rather than to exclude that of any who concurred in the necessity of a reformation.*

"'The means of comprehension intended were, not any general ambiguity or equivocation of terms, *but a prudent forbearance in all parties not to insist on the full extent of their opinions in matters not essential or fundamental; and in all cases to waive, as much as possible, tenets which might divide, where they wish to unite.*'" (Remarks on the Design and Formation of the Articles of the Church of England, by WILLIAM, Lord Bishop of Bangor, 1802.—pp. 23—25.)

We will finish with Bishop Horsley.

"It has been the fashion of late to talk about Arminianism as the system of the Church of England, and of Calvinism as something opposite to it, to which the Church is hostile. That I may not be misunderstood in what I have stated, or may have occasion further to say upon this subject, I must here declare, that I use the words Arminianism and Calvinism in that restricted sense in which they are now generally taken, to denote the doctrinal part of each system, as unconnected with the principles either of Arminians or Calvinists, upon Church discipline and Church government. This being premised, I assert, what I often have before asserted, and by God's grace I will persist in the assertion to my dying day, that so far is it from the truth that the Church of England is decidedly Arminian, and hostile to Calvinism, that the truth is this, *that upon the principal points in dispute between the Arminians and the Calvinists—upon all the points of doctrine characteristic of the two sects, the Church of England maintains an absolute neutrality; her Articles explicitly assert nothing but what is believed both by Arminians and by Calvinists.* The Calvinists indeed hold some opinions relative to the same points, which the Church of England has not gone the length of asserting in her Articles; but neither has she gone the length of explicitly contradicting those opinions; insomuch, that *there is nothing to hinder the Arminian and the highest supralapsarian Calvinist from walking together in the Church of England and Ireland as friends and brothers, if they both approve the discipline of the Church, and both are willing to submit to it.* Her discipline has been approved; it has been submitted to; it has been in former times most ably and zealously defended by the highest supralapsarian Calvinists. Such was the great Usher; such was Whitgift; such were many more, burning and shining lights of our Church in her early days (when first she shook off the Papal tyranny), long since gone to the resting-place of the spirits of the just."—(*Bishop* HORSLEY'*s Charges*, p. 216.—pp. 25, 26.)

So that these unhappy Curates are turned out of their bread for an exposition of the Articles which such men as Sherlock, Cleaver, and Horsley think may be fairly given of their meaning. We do not quote their authority, to show that the right interpretation is decided, but that it is doubtful—that there is a balance of authorities—that the opinion which Bishop Marsh has punished with poverty and degradation, has been considered to be legitimate by men at least as wise and learned as himself. In fact, it is to us perfectly clear, that the Articles were originally framed to prevent the very practices which Bishop Marsh has used for their protection—they were purposely so worded, that Arminians and Calvinists could sign them without blame. They were intended to combine both these descriptions of Protestants, and were meant principally for a bulwark against the Catholics.

"Thus," says Bishop Burnet, "was the doctrine of the Church cast into a short and plain form; in which they took care both to establish the positive articles of religion and to cut off the errors formerly introduced in the time of Popery, or of late broached by the Anabaptists and enthusiasts of Germany; *avoiding the niceties of schoolmen, or the peremptoriness of the writers of controversy; leaving, in matters that are more justly controvertible, a liberty to divines to follow their private opinions without thereby disturbing the peace of the*

Church." — (History of the Reformation, Book I. part ii. p. 168, folio edition.)

The next authority is that of Fuller.

"In the Convocation now sitting, wherein Alexander Nowel, Dean of St. Paul's, was Prolocutor, the nine-and-thirty Articles were composed. For the main they agree with those set forth in the reign of King Edward the Sixth, though in some particulars allowing more liberty to dissenting judgments. For instance, in this King's Articles it is said, that it is to be believed that Christ went down to hell (to preach to the spirits there); which last clause is left out in these Articles, and men left to a latitude concerning the cause, time, and manner of his descent.

"Hence some have unjustly taxed the composers for too much favour extended in their large expressions, clean through the contexture of these Articles, which should have tied men's consciences up closer, in more strict and particularising propositions, *which indeed proceeded from their commendable moderation.* Children's clothes ought to be made of the biggest, because afterwards their bodies will grow up to their garments. Thus the Articles of this English Protestant Church, in the infancy thereof, they thought good to draw up in general terms, foreseeing that posterity would grow up to fill the same: I mean these holy men did prudently prediscover, that differences in judgments would unavoidably happen in the Church, *and were loath to unchurch any, and drive them off from an ecclesiastical communion, for such petty differences, which made them pen the Articles in comprehensive words, to take in all who, differing in the branches, meet in the root of the same religion.*

"Indeed most of them had formerly been sufferers themselves, and cannot be said, in compiling these Articles, (an acceptable service, no doubt,) to offer to God what cost them nothing, some having paid imprisonment, others exile, all losses in their estates, for this their experimental knowledge in religion, *which made them the more merciful and tender in stating those points,* seeing such who themselves have been most patient in bearing, will be most pitiful in burdening the consciences of others."—(See FULLER'S *Church History,* book ix. p. 72, folio edit.)

But this generous and pacific spirit gives no room for the display of zeal and theological learning. The gate of admission has been left too widely open. I may as well be without power at all, if I cannot force my opinions upon other people. What was purposely left indefinite, I must make finite and exclusive. Questions of contention and difference must be laid before the servants of the Church, and nothing like neutrality in theological metaphysics allowed to the ministers of the Gospel. *I come not to bring peace, &c.*

The Bishop, however, seems to be quite satisfied with himself, when he states, that he has a *right to do* what he has done—just as if a man's character with his fellow-creatures depended upon legal rights alone, and not upon a discreet exercise of those rights. A man may persevere in doing what he has a right to do, till the Chancellor shuts him up in Bedlam, or till the mob pelt him as he passes. It must be presumed, that all men whom the law has invested with rights, Nature has invested with common sense to use those rights. For these reasons, children have no rights till they have gained some common sense, and old men have no rights after they lose their common sense. All men are at all times accountable to their fellow-creatures for the discreet exercise of every right they possess.

Prelates are fond of talking of *my* see, *my* clergy, *my* diocese, as if these things belonged to them, as their pigs and dogs belonged to them. They forget that the clergy, the diocese, and the Bishops themselves, all exist only for the public good; that the public are a third, and principal party in the whole concern. It is not simply the tormenting Bishop *versus* the tormented Curate, but the public against the system of tormenting; as tending to bring scandal upon religion and religious men. By the late alteration in the laws, the labourers in the vineyard are given up to the power of the inspectors of the vineyard. If he have the meanness and malice to do so, an inspector may worry and plague to death any labourer against whom he may have conceived an antipathy. As often as such cases are detected, we believe they will meet, in either House of Parliament, with the severest reprehension. The noblemen and gentlemen of Eng-

land will never allow their parish clergy to be treated with cruelty, injustice, and caprice, by men who were parish clergymen themselves yesterday, and who were trusted with power for very different purposes.

The Bishop of Peterborough complains of the insolence of the answers made to him. This is certainly not true of Mr. Grimshawe, Mr. Neville, or of the author of the Appeal. They have answered his Lordship with great force, great manliness, but with perfect respect. Does the Bishop expect that humble men, as learned as himself, are to be driven from their houses and homes by his new theology, and then to send him letters of thanks for the kicks and cuffs he has bestowed upon them? Men of very small incomes, be it known to his Lordship, have very often very acute feelings; and a Curate trod on feels a pang as great as when a Bishop is refuted.

We shall now give a specimen of some answers, which, we believe, would exclude a curate from the diocese of Peterborough, and contrast these answers with the Articles of the Church to which they refer. The 9th Article of the Church of England is upon Original Sin. Upon this point his Lordship puts the following question:—

"Did the fall of Adam produce such an effect on his posterity, that mankind became thereby a mass of mere corruption, or of absolute and entire depravity? Or is the effect only such, that we are very *far gone* from original righteousness, and of our own nature *inclined* to evil?"

Excluding Answer.

"The fall of Adam produced such an effect on his posterity, that mankind became thereby a mass of mere corruption, or of absolute and entire depravity."

The Ninth Article.

"Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam (as the Pelagians do vainly talk); but it is the fault or corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the spirit; and therefore, in every person born into the world, it deserveth God's wrath and damnation."

The 9th Question, Cap. 3rd, on Free Will, is as follows:—"Is it not contrary to Scripture to say, that man has no share in the work of his salvation?"

Excluding Answer.

"It is quite agreeable to Scripture to say, that man has no share in the work of his own salvation."

Tenth Article.

"The condition of man after the fall of Adam is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself, by his own natural strength and good works, to faith, and calling upon God. Wherefore, we have no power to do good works pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us when we have that good will."

On Redemption, his Lordship has the following question, Cap. 1st, Question 1st:—"Did Christ die for all men, or did he die only for a chosen few?"

Excluding Answer.

"Christ did not die for all men, but only for a chosen few."

Part of Article Seventh.

"Predestination to life is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby (before the foundations of the world were laid) he hath constantly decreed by his counsel, secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation those whom he hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ unto everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honour."

Now, whether these answers are right or wrong, we do not presume to decide; but we cannot help saying, there appears to be some little colour in the language of the Articles for the errors of the respondent. It does not appear at first sight to be such a deviation from the plain, literal, and gram-

matical sense of the Articles, as to merit rapid and ignominious ejectment from the bosom of the Church.

Now we have done with the Bishop. We give him all he asks as to his legal right; and only contend, that he is acting a very indiscreet and injudicious part — fatal to his quiet — fatal to his reputation as a man of sense — blamed by Ministers — blamed by all the Bench of Bishops — vexatious to the Clergy, and highly injurious to the Church. We mean no personal disrespect to the Bishop; we are as ignorant of him as of his victims. We should have been heartily glad if the debate in Parliament had put an end to these blamable excesses; and our only object, in meddling with the question, is to restrain the arm of Power within the limits of moderation and justice — one of the great objects which first led to the establishment of this Journal, and which, we hope, will always continue to characterise its efforts.

BOTANY BAY.

(E. Review, 1823.)

1. *Letter to Earl Bathurst.* By the Honourable H. Grey Bennet, M.P.
2. *Report of the Commissioner of Inquiry into the State of the Colony of New South Wales. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 19th June,* 1822.

Mr. Bigge's Report is somewhat long, and a little clumsy; but it is altogether the production of an honest, sensible, and respectable man, who has done his duty to the public, and justified the expense of his mission to the fifth or pickpocket quarter of the globe.

What manner of man is Governor Macquarrie? — Is all that Mr. Bennet says of him in the House of Commons true? These are the questions which Lord Bathurst sent Mr. Bigge, and very properly sent him, 28,000 miles to answer. The answer is, that Governor Macquarrie is not a dishonest man, nor a jobber; but arbitrary, in many things scandalously negligent, very often wrong-headed, and, upon the whole, very deficient in that good sense and vigorous understanding, which his new and arduous situation so manifestly requires.

Ornamental architecture in Botany Bay! How it could enter into the head of any human being to adorn public buildings at the Bay, or to aim at any other architectural purpose but the exclusion of wind and rain, we are utterly at a loss to conceive. Such an expense is not only lamentable for the waste of property it makes in the particular instance, but because it destroys that guarantee of sound sense which the Government at home must require in those who preside over distant colonies. A man who thinks of pillars and pilasters, when half the colony are wet through for want of any covering at all, cannot be a wise or prudent person. He seems to be ignorant, that the prevention of rheumatism in all young colonies is a much more important object than the gratification of taste, or the display of skill.

"I suggested to Governor Macquarrie the expediency of stopping all work then in progress that was merely of an ornamental nature, and of postponing its execution till other more important buildings were finished. With this view it was, that I recommended to the Governor to stop the progress of a large church, the foundation of which had been laid previous to my arrival, and which, by the estimate of Mr. Greenway the architect, would have required six years to complete. By a change that I recommended, and which the Governor adopted, in the destination of the new Court-house at Sydney, the accommodation of a new church is probably by this time secured. As I conceived that considerable advantage had been gained by inducing Governor Macquarrie to suspend the progress of the larger church, I did not deem it necessary to make any pointed objection to the addition of these ornamental parts of the smaller one; though I regretted to observe in this instance, as well as in those of the new stables at Sydney, the turnpike gate-house and the new fountain there, as well as in the repairs of an old church at Paramatta, how much more the embellishment of these places had been considered by the Governor than the real and pressing wants of the colony. The buildings that I had recommended to his early attention in Sydney were, a new gaol, a school-house, and a market-house.

The defects of the first of these buildings will be more particularly pointed out when I come to describe the buildings that have been erected in New South Wales. It is sufficient for me now to observe, that they were striking, and of a nature not to be remedied by additions or repairs. The other two were in a state of absolute ruin; they were also of undeniable importance and necessity. Having left Sydney in the month of November, 1820, with these impressions, and with a belief that the suggestions I had made to Governor Macquarrie respecting them had been partly acted upon, and would continue to be so during my absence in Van Diemen's Land, it was not without much surprise and regret that I learnt, during my residence in that settlement, the resumption of the work at the large church in Sydney, and the steady continuation of the others that I had objected to, especially the Governor's stables at Sydney. I felt the greater surprise in receiving the information respecting this last-mentioned structure, during my absence in Van Diemen's Land, as the Governor himself had, upon many occasions, expressed to me his own regret at having ever sanctioned it, and his consciousness of its extravagant dimensions and ostentatious character."—(*Report*, pp. 51, 52.)

One of the great difficulties in Botany Bay is to find proper employment for the great mass of convicts who are sent out. Governor Macquarrie selects all the best artisans, of every description, for the use of Government; and puts the poets, attornies, and politicians up to auction. The evil consequences of this are manifold. In the first place, from possessing so many of the best artificers, the Governor is necessarily turned into a builder; and immense drafts are drawn upon the Treasury at home, for buildings better adapted for Regent Street than the Bay. In the next place, the poor settler finding that the convict attorney is very awkward at cutting timber, or catching kangaroos, soon returns him upon the hands of Government in a much worse plight than that in which he was received. Not only are governors thus debauched into useless and expensive builders, but the colonists who are scheming and planning with all the activity of new settlers, cannot find workmen to execute their designs.

What two ideas are more inseparable than Beer and Britannia?—what event more awfully important to an English colony, than the erection of its first brewhouse?—and yet it required, in Van Diemen's Land, the greatest solicitation to the Government, and all the influence of Mr. Bigge, to get it effected. The Government, having obtained possession of the best workmen, keep them; their manumission is much more infrequent than that of the useless and unprofitable convicts; in other words, one man is punished for his skill, and another rewarded for his inutility. Guilty of being a locksmith—guilty of stonemasonry, or brickmaking;—these are the second verdicts brought in, in New South Wales; and upon them is regulated the duration or mitigation of punishment awarded in the mother-country. At the very period when the Governor assured Lord Bathurst, in his despatches, that he kept and employed so numerous a gang of workmen, only because the inhabitants could not employ them, Mr. Bigge informs us, that their services would have been most acceptable to the colonists. Most of the settlers, at the time of Mr. Bigge's arrival, from repeated refusals and disappointments, had been so convinced of the impossibility of obtaining workmen, that they had ceased to make application to the Governor. Is it to be believed that a governor, placed over a land of convicts, and capable of guarding his limbs from any sudden collision with odometrous stones, or vertical posts of direction, should make no distinction between the simple convict and the double and treble convict—the man of three juries, who has three times appeared at the Bailey, trilarcenous—three times driven over the seas?

"I think it necessary to notice the want of attention that has prevailed, until a very late period, at Sydney, to the circumstances of those convicts who have been transported a second and a third time. Although the knowledge of these facts is transmitted in the hulk lists, or acquired without difficulty during the passage, it never has occurred to Governor Macquarrie or to the superintendent of convicts, to make any difference in the condition of these men, not even to disappoint the views they may

be supposed to have indulged by the success of a criminal enterprise in England, and by transferring the fruits of it to New South Wales.

"To accomplish this very simple but important object, nothing more was necessary than to consign these men to any situation rather than that which their friends had selected for them, and distinctly to declare in the presence of their comrades at the first muster on their arrival, that no consideration or favour would be shown to those who had violated the law a second time, and that the mitigation of their sentences must be indefinitely postponed." —(*Report*, p. 19.)

We were not a little amused at Governor Macquarrie's laureate — a regular Mr. Southey — who, upon the king's birth-day, sings the praises of Governor Macquarrie.* The case of this votary of Apollo and Mercury was a case for life; the offence a menacing epistle, or, as low people call it, a *threatening letter*. He has been pardoned, however, — bursting his shackles, like Orpheus of old, with song and metre, and is well spoken of by Mr. Bigge, but no specimen of his poetry given. One of the best and most enlightened men in the settlement appears to be Mr. Marsden, a clergyman at Paramatta. Mr. Bennet represents him as a gentleman of great feeling, whose life is embittered by the scenes of horror and vice it is his lot to witness at Paramatta. Indeed he says of himself, that in consequence of these things, "he does not enjoy one happy moment from the beginning to the end of the week!" This letter, at the time, produced a very considerable sensation in this country. The idea of a man of refinement and feeling wearing away his life in the midst of scenes of crime and debauchery to which he can apply no corrective, is certainly a very melancholy and affecting picture; but there is no story, however elegant and eloquent, which does not require, for the purposes of justice, to be turned to the other side, and viewed in reverse. The Rev. Mr. Marsden (says Mr. Bigge), *being himself accustomed to traffic in spirits*, must necessarily feel displeased at having so many public houses licensed in the neighbourhood. — (p. 14.)

"As to Mr. Marsden's troubles of mind" (says the Governor) "and pathetic display of sensibility and humanity, they must be so deeply seated, and so far removed from the surface, as to escape all possible observation. His habits are those of a man for ever engaged in some active, animated pursuit. No man travels more from town to town, or from house to house. His deportment is at all times that of a person the most gay and happy. When I was honoured with his society, he was by far the most cheerful person I met in the colony. Where his hours of sorrow were spent it is hard to divine; for the variety of his pursuits, both in his own concerns, and in those of others, is so extensive, in farming, grazing, manufactories, transactions, that with his clerical duties, he seems, to use a common phrase, to have his hands full of work. And the particular subject to which he imputes this extreme depression of mind, is, besides, one for which few people here will give him much credit." — (*Macquarrie's Letter to Lord Sidmouth*, p. 18.)

There is certainly a wide difference between a man of so much feeling, that he has not a moment's happiness from the beginning to the end of the week, and a little merry bustling clergyman, largely concerned in the sale of rum, and brisk at a bargain for barley. Mr. Bigge's evidence, however, is very much in favour of Mr. Marsden. He seems to think him a man of highly respectable character and superior understanding, and that he has been dismissed from the magistracy by Governor Macquarrie, in a very rash, unjustifiable, and even tyrannical manner; and in these opinions, we must say, the facts seem to bear out the Report of the Commissioner.

Colonel Macquarrie not only dismisses honest and irreproachable men in a country where their existence is scarce, and their services inestimable, but he advances convicts to the situation and dignity of magistrates. Mr. Bennet lays great stress upon this, and makes it one of his strongest charges against the Governor; and the Commissioner also takes part against it. But we confess we have great doubts on the subject; and are by no means

* *Vide* Report, p. 146.

satisfied that the system of the Governor was not, upon the whole, the wisest and best adapted to the situation of the colony. Men are governed by words; and under the infamous term *convict*, are comprehended crimes of the most different degrees and species of guilt. One man is transported for stealing three hams and a pot of sausages; and in the next berth to him on board the transport is a young surgeon, who has been engaged in the mutiny at the Nore; the third man is for extorting money; the fourth was in a respectable situation of life at the time of the Irish Rebellion, and was so ill read in history as to imagine that Ireland had been ill-treated by England, and so bad a reasoner as to suppose, that nine Catholics ought not to pay tithes to one Protestant. Then comes a man who set his house on fire, to cheat the Phœnix Office; and, lastly, that most glaring of all human villains, a poacher, driven from Europe, wife and child, by thirty lords of manors, at the Quarter Sessions, for killing a partridge. Now, all these are crimes no doubt—particularly the last; but they are surely crimes of very different degrees of intensity to which different degrees of contempt and horror are attached—and from which those who have committed them may, by subsequent morality, emancipate themselves, with different degrees of difficulty, and with more or less of success. A warrant granted by a reformed bacon-stealer would be absurd; but there is hardly any reason why a foolish hot-brained young blockhead, who chose to favour the mutineers at the Nore when he was sixteen years of age, may not make a very loyal subject, and a very respectable and respected magistrate, when he is forty years of age, and has cast his Jacobine teeth, and fallen into the practical jobbing and loyal baseness which so commonly developes itself about that period of life. Therefore, to say that a man must be placed in no situation of trust or elevation, as a magistrate, merely because he is a convict, is to govern mankind with a dictionary, and to surrender sense and usefulness to sound. Take the following case, for instance, from Mr. Bigge:—

"The next person, from the same class, that was so distinguished by Governor Macquarrie, was the Rev. Mr. Fulton. He was transported by the sentence of a court-martial in Ireland, during the Rebellion; and on his arrival in New South Wales, in the year 1800, was sent to Norfolk Island to officiate as chaplain. He returned to New South Wales in the year 1804, and performed the duties of chaplain at Sydney and Paramatta.

"In the divisions that prevailed in the colony previous to the arrest of Governor Bligh, Mr. Fulton took no part; but, happening to form one of his family when the person of the Governor was menaced with violence, he courageously opposed himself to the military party that entered the house, and gave an example of courage and devotion to the authority of Governor Bligh, which, if partaken either by the officer or his few adherents, would have spared him the humiliation of a personal arrest, and rescued his authority from the disgrace of open and violent suspension."—(*Report*, pp. 83, 84.)

The particular nature of the place too must be remembered. It is seldom, we suspect, that absolute dunces go to the Bay, but commonly men of active minds, and considerable talents in their various lines—who have not learnt, indeed, the art of self-discipline and control, but who are sent to learn it in the bitter school of adversity. And when this medicine produces its proper effect—when sufficient time has been given to show a thorough change in character and disposition—a young colony really cannot afford to dispense with the services of any person of superior talents. Activity, resolution, and acuteness, are of such immense importance in the hard circumstances of a new State, that they must be eagerly caught at, and employed as soon as they are discovered. Though all may not be quite so unobjectionable as could be wished—

"Res dura, et regni novitas me talia cogunt
Moliri"—

as Colonel Macquarrie probably quoted to Mr. Commissioner Bigge. As for the conduct of those extra-moralists, who come to settle in a land of crime,

and refuse to associate with a convict legally pardoned, however light his original offence, however perfect his subsequent conduct—we have no toleration for such folly and foppery. To sit down to dinner with men who have not been tried for their lives is a luxury which cannot be enjoyed in such a country. It is entirely out of the question; and persons so dainty, and so truly admirable, had better settle at Clapham Common than at Botany Bay. Our trade in Australasia is to turn scoundrels into honest men. If you come among us, and bring with you a good character, and will lend us your society, as a stimulus and reward to men recovering from degradation, you will confer the greatest possible benefit upon the colony; but if you turn up your nose at repentance, insult those unhappy people with your character, and fiercely stand up as a moral bully, and a virtuous braggadocio, it would have been far better for us if Providence had directed you to any other part of the globe than to Botany Bay— which was colonised, not to gratify the insolence of Pharisees, but to heal the contrite spirit of repentant sinners. Mr. Marsden, who has no happiness from six o'clock Monday morning, till the same hour the week following, will not meet pardoned convicts in society. We have no doubt Mr. Marsden is a very respectable clergyman; but is there not something very different from this in the Gospel? The most resolute and inflexible persons in the rejection of pardoned convicts were some of the marching regiments stationed at Botany Bay — men, of course, who had uniformly shunned, in the Old World, the society of gamesters, prostitutes, drunkards, and blasphemers—who had ruined no tailors, corrupted no wives, and had entitled themselves, by a long course of solemnity and decorum, to indulge in all the insolence of purity and virtue.

In this point, then, of restoring convicts to society, we side, as far as the principle goes, with the Governor; but we are far from undertaking to say that his application of the principle has been on all occasions prudent and judicious. Upon the absurdity of his conduct in attempting to *force* the society of the pardoned convicts upon the undetected part of the colony, there can be no doubt. These are points upon which everybody must be allowed to judge for themselves. The greatest monarchs in Europe cannot control opinion upon those points—sovereigns far exceeding Colonel Lachlan Macquarrie, in the antiquity of their dynasty, and the extent, wealth, and importance of their empire.

"It was in vain to assemble them" (the pardoned convicts), "even on public occasions, at Government House, or to point them out to the especial notice and favour of strangers, or to favour them with particular marks of his own attention upon these occasions, if they still continued to be shunned or disregarded by the rest of the company.

"With the exception of the Reverend Mr. Fulton, and, on some occasions, of Mr. Redfern, I never observed that the other persons of this class participated in the general attentions of the company; and the evidence of Mr. Judge-Advocate Wylde and Major Bell both prove the embarrassment in which they were left on occasions that came within their notice.

"Nor has the distinction that has been conferred upon them by Governor Macquarrie produced any effect in subduing the prejudices or objections of the class of free inhabitants to associate with them. One instance only has occurred, in which the wife of a respectable individual, and a magistrate, has been visited by the wives of the officers of the garrison, and by a few of the married ladies of the colony. It is an instance that reflects equal credit upon the individual herself, as upon the feelings and motives of those by whom she has been so noticed: but the circumstances of her case were very peculiar, and those that led to her introduction to society were very much of a personal kind. It has generally been thought, that such instances would have been more numerous if Governor Macquarrie had allowed every person to have followed the dictates of their own judgment upon a subject, on which, of all others, men are least disposed to be dictated to, and most disposed to judge for themselves.

"Although the emancipated convicts, whom he has selected from their class, are persons who generally bear a good character in New South Wales, yet that opinion of

them is by no means universal. Those, however, who entertained a good opinion of them would have proved it by their notice, as Mr. M'Arthur has been in the habit of doing, by the kind and marked notice that he took of Mr. Fitzgerald; and those who entertained a different opinion would not have contracted an aversion to the principle of their introduction, from being obliged to witness what they considered to be an indiscreet and erroneous application of it." —(*Report*, p. 150.)

We do not think Mr. Bigge exactly seizes the sense of Colonel Macquarrie's phrase, when the Colonel speaks of restoring men to the rank of society they have lost. Men may either be classed by wealth and education, or by character. All honest men, whether counts or cobblers, are of the same rank, if classed by moral distinctions. It is a common phrase to say that such a man can no longer be ranked among honest men; that he has been degraded from the class of respectable persons; and, therefore, by restoring a convict to the rank he has lost, the Governor may very fairly be supposed to mean the moral rank. In discussing the question of granting offices of trust to convicts, the importance of the *Scelerati* must not be overlooked. Their numbers are very considerable. They have one eighth of all the granted land in the colony; and there are among them individuals of very large fortune. Mr. Redfern has 2600 acres, Mr. Lord 4365 acres, and Mr. Samuel Terry 19,000 acres. As this man's history is a specimen of the mud and dirt out of which great families often arise, let the *Terry Filii*, the future warriors, legislators, and nobility of the Bay, learn from what, and whom, they sprang.

"The first of these individuals, Samuel Terry, was transported to the colony when young. He was placed in a gang of stone-masons at Paramatta, and assisted in the building of the gaol. Mr. Marsden states, that during this period he was brought before him for neglect of duty, and punished; but, by his industry in other ways, he was enabled to set up a small retail shop, in which he continued till the expiration of his term of service. He then repaired to Sydney, where he extended his business, and, by marriage, increased his capital. He for many years kept a public house and retail shop, to which the smaller settlers resorted from the country, and where, after intoxicating themselves with spirits, they signed obligations and powers of attorney to confess judgment, which were always kept ready for execution. By these means, and by an active use of the common arts of over-reaching ignorant and worthless men, Samuel Terry has been able to accumulate a considerable capital, and a quantity of land in New South Wales, inferior only to that which is held by Mr. D'Arcy Wentworth. He ceased, at the late regulations introduced by the magistrates at Sydney, in February, 1820, to sell spirituous liquors, and he is now become one of the principal speculators in the purchase of investments at Sydney, and lately established a water-mill in the swampy plains between that town and Botany Bay, which did not succeed. Out of the 19,000 acres of land held by Samuel Terry, 140 only are stated to be cleared; but he possesses 1450 head of horned cattle, and 3800 sheep."—(*Report*, p. 141.)

Upon the subject of the New South Wales Bank, Mr. Bigge observes,—

"Upon the first of these occasions, it became an object both with Governor Macquarrie and Mr. Judge-Advocate Wylde, who took an active part in the establishment of the bank, to unite in its favour the support and contributions of the individuals of all classes of the colony. Governor Macquarrie felt assured, that, without such co-operation, the bank could not be established; for he was convinced that the emancipated convicts were the most opulent members of the community. A committee was formed for the purpose of drawing up the rules and regulations of the establishment, in which are to be found the names of George Howe, the printer of the Sydney Gazette, who was also a retail dealer; Mr. Simon Lord, and Mr. Edward Eager, all emancipated convicts, and the last only conditionally.

"Governor Macquarrie had always understood, and strongly wished, that in asking for the co-operation of all classes of the community in the formation of the bank, a share in its direction and management should also be communicated to them."—(*Report*, p. 150.)

In the discussion of this question, we became acquainted with a piece of military etiquette, of which we were previously ignorant. An officer, invited to dinner by the Governor, cannot refuse, unless in case of sickness. This is the most complete tyranny we ever

heard of. If the officer comes out to his duty at the proper minute, with his proper number of buttons and epaulettes, what matters it to the Governor or any body else, where he dines? He may as well be ordered what to eat, as where to dine — be confined to the upper or under side of the meat — be denied gravy, or refused melted butter. But there is no end to the small tyranny and puerile vexations of a military life.

The mode of employing convicts upon their arrival appears to us very objectionable. If a man is skilful as a mechanic, he is added to the Government gangs; and in proportion to his skill and diligence, his chance of manumission, or of remission of labour, is lessened. If he is not skilful, or not skilful in any trade wanted by Government, he is applied for by some settler, to whom he pays from 5*s.* to 10*s.* a week; and is then left at liberty to go where, and work for whomsoever, he pleases. In the same manner, a convict who is rich is applied for, and obtains his weekly liberty and idleness by the purchased permission of the person to whom he is consigned.

The greatest possible inattention or ignorance appears to have prevailed in manumitting convicts for labour—and for *such* labour! not for cleansing Augean stables, or draining Pontine marshes, or damming out out a vast length of the Adriatic, but for working five weeks with a single horse and cart in making the road to Bathurst Plains. Was such labour worth five pounds? And is it to be understood, that liberty is to be restored to any man who will do five pounds' worth of work in Australasia? Is this comment upon transportation to be circulated in the cells of Newgate, or in the haunts of those persons who are doomed to inhabit them?

"Another principle by which Governor Macquarrie has been guided in bestowing pardons and indulgences, is that of considering them as rewards for any particular labour or enterprise. It was upon this principle, that the men who were employed in working upon the Bathurst Road, in the year 1815, and those who contributed to that operation by the loan of their own carts and horses, or of those that they procured, obtained pardons, emancipations, and tickets of leave. To 39 men who were employed as labourers in this work, three free pardons were given, one ticket of leave, and 35 emancipations; and two of them only had held tickets of leave before they commenced their labour. Seven convicts received emancipations for supplying horses and carts for the carriage of provisions and stores as the party was proceeding; six out of this number having previously held tickets of leave.

"Eight other convicts (four of whom held tickets of leave) received emancipations for assisting with carts, and one horse to each, in the transport of provisions and baggage for the use of Governor Macquarrie and his suite, on their journey from the river Nepean to Bathurst, in the year 1816; a service that did not extend beyond the period of five weeks, and was attended with no risk, and very little exertion.

"Between the months of January, 1816, and June, 1818, nine convicts, of whom six held tickets of leave, obtained emancipation for sending carts and horses to convey provisions and baggage from Paramatta to Bathurst, for the use of Mr. Oxley, the surveyor-general, in his two expeditions into the interior of the country. And in the same period, 23 convict labourers and mechanics obtained emancipations for labour and service performed at Bathurst.

"The nature of the services performed by these convicts, and the manner in which some of them were recommended, excited much surprise in the colony, as well as great suspicion of the purity of the channels through which the recommendations passed."—(*Report*, pp. 122, 123.)

If we are to judge from the number of jobs detected by Mr. Bigge, Botany Bay seems very likely to do justice to the mother-country from whence it sprang. Mr. Redfern, surgeon, seems to use the public rhubarb for his private practice. Mr. Hutchinson, superintendent, makes a very comfortable thing of the assignment of convicts. Major Druit was found selling their own cabbages to Government in a very profitable manner; and many comfortable little practices of this nature are noticed by Mr. Bigge.

Among other sources of profit, the superintendent of convicts was the banker; two occupations which seem to be eminently compatible with each other, inasmuch as they afford to the superintendent the opportunity of evincing his impartiality, and loading

with equal labour every convict, without reference to their banking accounts, to the profit they afford, or the trouble they create. It appears, however (very strangely), from the Report, that the money of convicts was not always recovered with the same readiness it was received.

Mr. Richard Fitzgerald, in September, 1819, was comptroller of provisions in Emu Plains, storekeeper at Windsor, and superintendent of Government works at the same place. He was also a proprietor of land and stock in the neighbourhood, and kept a public house in Windsor, of which an emancipated Jew was the ostensible manager, upon whom Fitzgerald gave orders for goods and spirits in payment for labour on the public works. These two places are fifteen miles distant from each other, and convicts are to be watched and managed at both. It cannot be imagined that the convicts are slow in observing or following these laudable examples; and their conduct will add another instance of the vigilance of Macquarrie's government.

"The stores and materials used in the different buildings at Sydney are kept in a magazine in the lumber yard, and are distributed according to the written requisitions of the different overseers that are made during the day, and that are addressed to the storekeeper in the lumber yard. They are conveyed from thence to the buildings by the convict mechanics; and no account of the expenditure or employment of the stores is kept by the overseers, or rendered to the storekeeper. It was only in the early part of the year 1820 that an account was opened by him of the different materials used in each work or building; and in February, 1821, this account was considerably in arrear. The temptation, therefore, that is afforded to the convict mechanics who work in the lumber yard, in secreting tools, stores, and implements, and to those who work at the different buildings, is very great, and the loss to Government is considerable. The tools, moreover, have not latterly been mustered as they used to be once a month, except where one of the convicts is removed from Sydney to another station."—(*Report*, pp. 36, 37.)

If it were right to build fine houses in a new colony, common sense seems to point out a control upon the expenditure, with such a description of workmen. What must become of that country where the buildings are useless, the Governor not wise, the public the paymaster, the accounts not in existence, and all the artisans thieves?

A horrid practice prevailed, of the convicts accepting a sum of money from the captain, in their voyage out, in lieu of their regular ration of provisions. This ought to be restrained by the severest penalties.

What is it that can be urged for Governor Macquarrie, after the following picture of the Hospital at Paramatta? It not only justifies his recall, but seems to require (if there are means of reaching such neglect) his severe punishment.

"The women, who had become most profligate and hardened by habit, were associated in their daily tasks with those who had very lately arrived, to whom the customs and practices of the colony were yet unknown, and who might have escaped the consequences of such pernicious lessons, if a little care, and a small portion of expense, had been spared in providing them with a separate apartment during the hours of labour. As a place of employment, the factory at Paramatta was not only very defective, but very prejudicial. The insufficient accommodation that it afforded to those females who might be well disposed, presented an early incitement, if not an excuse for, their resorting to indiscriminate prostitution; and on the evening of their arrival at Paramatta, those who were not deploring their state of abandonment and distress, were traversing the streets in search of the guilty means of future support. The state in which the place itself was kept, and the state of disgusting filth in which I found it, both on an early visit after my arrival, and on one preceding my departure; the disordered, unruly, and licentious appearance of the women, manifested the little degree of control in which the female convicts were kept, and the little attention that was paid to anything beyond the mere performance of a certain portion of labour."—(*Report*, p. 70.)

It might naturally be supposed, that any man sent across the globe with a good salary, for the express purpose of governing, and, if possible, of reforming convicts, would have preferred the

morals of his convicts to the accommodation of his horses. Let Mr. Bigge, a very discreet and moderate man, be heard upon these points.

"Having observed, in Governor Macquarrie's answer to Mr. Marsden, that he justified the delay that occurred, and was still to take place, in the construction of a proper place of reception for the female convicts, by the want of any specific instructions from your Lordship to undertake such a building, and which he states that he solicited at any early period of his government, and considered indispensable, I felt it to be my duty to call to the recollection of Governor Macquarrie, that he had undertaken several buildings of much less urgent necessity than the factory at Paramatta, without waiting for any such indispensable authority; and I now find that the construction of it was announced by him to your Lordship in the year 1817, as then in his contemplation, without making any specific allusion to the evils which the want of it had so long occasioned; that the contract for building it was announced to the public on the 21st of May, 1818, and that your Lordship's approval of it was not signified until the 24th August, 1818, and could not have reached Governor Macquarrie's hands until nearly a year after the work had been undertaken. It appears, therefore, that if want of authority had been the sole cause of the delay in building the factory at Paramatta, that cause would not only have operated in the month of March, 1818, but it would have continued to operate until the want of authority had been formally supplied. Governor Macquarrie, however, must be conscious, that after he had stated to Mr. Marsden in the year 1815, and with an appearance of regret, that the want of authority prevented him from undertaking the construction of a building of such undeniable necessity and importance as the factory at Paramatta, he had undertaken several buildings, which, though useful in themselves, were of less comparative importance; *and had commenced, in the month of August*, 1817, *the laborious and expensive construction of his own stables at Sydney, to which I have already alluded*, without any previous communication to your Lordship, and in direct opposition to an instruction that must have then reached him, and that forcibly warned him of the consequences."—(*Report*, p. 71.)

It is the fashion very much among the Tories of the House of Commons, and all those who love the effects of public liberty, without knowing or caring how it is preserved, to attack every person who complains of abuses, and to accuse him of gross exaggeration. No sooner is the name of any public thief, or of any tormentor, or oppressor, mentioned in that Honourable House, than out bursts the spirit of jobbing eulogium, and there is not a virtue under heaven which is not ascribed to the delinquent in question, and vouched for by the most irrefragable testimony. If Mr. Bennet or Sir Francis Burdett had attacked them, and they had now been living, how many honourable members would have vouched for the honesty of Dudley and Empson, the gentleness of Jeffries, or the genius of Blackmore? What human virtue did not Aris and the governor of Ilchester jail possess? Who was not ready to come forward to vouch for the attentive humanity of Governor Macquarrie? What scorn and wit would it have produced from the Treasury Bench, if Mr. Bennet had stated the superior advantages of the horses over the convicts?—and all the horrors and immoralities, the filth and wretchedness, of the female prison of Paramatta? Such a case, proved as this now is, beyond the power of contradiction, ought to convince the most hardy and profligate scoffers, that there is really a great deal of occasional neglect and oppression in the conduct of public servants; and that, in spite of all the official praise, which is ever ready for the perpetrators of crime, there is a great deal of real malversation which should be dragged to the light of day, by the exertions of bold and virtuous men. If we had found, from the Report of Mr. Bigge, that the charges of Mr. Bennet were without any, or without adequate foundation, it would have given us great pleasure to have vindicated the Governor; but Mr. Bennet has proved his indictment. It is impossible to read the foregoing quotation, and not to perceive that the conduct and proceedings of Governor Macquarrie imperiously required the exposure they have received; and that it would have been much to the credit of Government if he had been removed long ago from a situation which, but

for the exertions of Mr. Bennet, we believe he would have held to this day.

The sick, from Mr. Bigge's Report, appear to have fared as badly as the sinful. Good water was scarce, proper persons to wait upon the patients could not be obtained; and so numerous were the complaints from this quarter, that the Governor makes an order for the exclusion of all hospital grievances and complaints, *except on one day in the month* — dropsy swelling, however, fever burning, and ague shaking, in the meantime, without waiting for the arrangements of Governor Macquarrie, or consulting the *mollia tempora fandi.*

In permitting individuals to distil their own grain, the Government of Botany Bay appears to us to be quite right. It is impossible, in such a colony, to prevent unlawful distillation to a considerable extent; and it is as well to raise upon spirits (as something must be taxed) that slight duty which renders the contraband trade not worth following. Distillation, too, always insures a magazine against famine, by which New South Wales has more than once been severely visited. It opens a market for grain where markets are very distant, and where redundance and famine seem very often to succeed each other. The cheapness of spirits to such working people as know how to use them with moderation, is a great blessing; and we doubt whether that moderation, after the first burst of ebriety, is not just as likely to be learnt in plenty as in scarcity.

We were a little surprised at the scanty limits allowed to convicts for sleeping on board the transports. Mr. Bigge (of whose sense and humanity we really have not the slightest doubt) states eighteen inches to be quite sufficient — twice the length of a small sheet of letter paper. The printer's devil, who carries our works to the press, informs us that the allowance to the demons of the type is double foolscap length, or twenty-four inches. The great city upholsterers generally consider six feet as barely sufficient for a person rising in business, and assisting occasionally at official banquets.

Mrs. Fry's* system is well spoken of by Mr. Bigge; and its useful effect in promoting order and decency among floating convicts fully admitted.

In a voyage to Botany Bay by Mr. Read, he states that, while the convict vessel lay at anchor, about to sail, a boat from shore reached the ship, and from it stepped a clerk of the Bank of England. The convicts felicitated themselves upon the acquisition of so gentlemanlike a companion; but it soon turned out that the visitant had no intention of making so long a voyage. Finding that they were not to have the pleasure of his company, the convicts very naturally thought of picking his pockets; the necessity of which professional measure was prevented by a speedy distribution of their contents. Forth from his bill-case this votary of Plutus drew his nitid Newlands; all the forgers and utterers were mustered on deck; and to each of them was well and truly paid into his hand a five pound note; less acceptable, perhaps, than if privately removed from the person, but still joyfully received. This was well intended on the part of the Directors: but the consequences it is scarcely necessary to enumerate; a large stock of rum was immediately laid in from the circumambient slop-boats; and the materials of constant intoxication secured for the rest of the voyage.

The following account of pastoral convicts is striking and picturesque:—

* We are sorry it should have been imagined, from some of our late observations on prison discipline, that we meant to disparage the exertions of Mrs. Fry. For prisoners before trial, it is perfect; but where imprisonment is intended for punishment, and not for detention, it requires, as we have endeavoured to show, a very different system. The Prison Society (an excellent, honourable, and most useful institution of some of the best men in England) have certainly, in their first Numbers, fallen into the common mistake, of supposing that the reformation of the culprit, and not the prevention of the crime, was the main object of imprisonment; and have, in consequence, taken some false views of the method of treating prisoners—the exposition of which, after the usual manner of flesh and blood, makes them a little angry. But, in objects of so high a nature, what matters *who* is right?—the only question is, *What* is right?

"I observed that a great many of the convicts in Van Diemen's Land wore jackets and trousers of the kangaroo skin, and sometimes caps of the same material, which they obtain from the stock-keepers who are employed in the interior of the country. The labour of several of them differs, in this respect, from that of the convicts in New South Wales, and is rather pastoral than agricultural. Permission having been given, for the last five years, to the settlers to avail themselves of the ranges of open plains and valleys that lie on either side of the road leading from Austin's Ferry to Launceston, a distance of 120 miles, their flocks and herds have been committed to the care of convict shepherds and stock-keepers, who are sent to these cattle ranges, distant sometimes 30 or 40 miles from their masters' estates.

"The boundaries of these tracts are described in the tickets of occupation by which they are held, and which are made renewable every year, on payment of a fee to the Lieutenant-Governor's clerk. One or more convicts are stationed on them, to attend to the flocks and cattle, and are supplied with wheat, tea, and sugar, at the monthly visits of the owner. They are allowed the use of a musket and a few cartridges to defend themselves against the natives; and they have also dogs, with which they hunt the kangaroos, whose flesh they eat, and dispose of their skins to persons passing from Hobart Town to Launceston, in exchange for tea and sugar. They thus obtain a plentiful supply of food, and sometimes succeed in cultivating a few vegetables. Their habitations are made of turf, and thatched; as the bark of the dwarf eucalyptus, or gum-trees of the plains, and the interior, in Van Diemen's Land, is not of sufficient expanse to form covering or shelter."—(*Report*, pp. 107, 108.)

A London thief, clothed in kangaroo's skins, lodged under the bark of the dwarf eucalyptus, and keeping sheep, fourteen thousand miles from Piccadilly, with a crook bent into the shape of a picklock, is not an uninteresting picture; and an engraving of it might have a very salutary effect — provided no engraving were made of his convict master, to whom the sheep belong.

The Maroon Indians were hunted by dogs — the fugitive convicts are recovered by the natives.

"The native blacks that inhabit the neighbourhood of Port Hunter and Port Stephens have become very active in retaking the fugitive convicts. They accompany the soldiers who are sent in pursuit; and, by the extraordinary strength of sight they possess, improved by their daily exercise of it in pursuit of kangaroos and opossums, they can trace to a great distance, with wonderful accuracy, the impressions of the human foot. Nor are they afraid of meeting the fugitive convicts in the woods, when sent in their pursuit, without the soldiers; by their skill in throwing their long and pointed wooden darts, they wound and disable them, strip them of their clothes, and bring them back as prisoners, by unknown roads and paths, to the Coal River.

"They are rewarded for these enterprises by presents of maize and blankets; and, notwithstanding the apprehensions of revenge from the convicts whom they bring back, they continue to live in Newcastle and its neighbourood; but are observed to prefer the society of the soldiers to that of the convicts."—(*Report*, p. 117.)

Of the convicts in New South Wales, Mr. Bigge found about eight or nine in a hundred to be persons of respectable character and conduct, though the evidence respecting them is not quite satisfactory. But the most striking and consolatory passage in the whole Report is the following: —

"The marriages of the native-born youths with female convicts are very rare; a circumstance that is attributable to the general disinclination to early marriage that is observable amongst them, and partly to the abandoned and dissolute habits of the female convicts; but chiefly to a sense of pride in the native-born youths, approaching to contempt for the vices and depravity of the convicts, even when manifested in the persons of their own parents."—(*Report*, p. 105.)

Everything is to be expected from these feelings. They convey to the mother-country the first proof that the foundations of a mighty empire are laid.

We were somewhat surprised to find Governor Macquarrie contending with Mr. Bigge, that it was no part of his, the Governor's duty to select and separate the useless from the useful convicts, or to determine, except in particular cases, to whom they are to be assigned. In other words, he wishes to effect the customary separation of salary and duty — the grand principle which ap-

pears to pervade all human institutions, and to be the most invincible of all human abuses. Not only are Church, King, and State, allured by this principle of vicarious labour, but the pot-boy has a lower pot-boy, who for a small portion of the small gains of his principal, arranges, with inexhaustible sedulity, the subdivided portions of drink, and intensely perspiring, disperses, in bright pewter, the frothy elements of joy.

There is a very awkward story of a severe flogging inflicted upon three freemen by Governor Macquarrie, without complaint to, or intervention of, any magistrate; a fact not denied by the Governor, and for which no adequate apology, nor anything approaching to an adequate apology, is offered. These Asiatic and satrapical proceedings, however, we have reason to think, are exceedingly disrelished by London juries. The profits of having been unjustly flogged at Botany Bay (Scarlett for the plaintiff) is good property, and would fetch a very considerable sum at the Auction Mart. The Governor, in many instances, appears to have confounded diversity of opinion upon particular measures, with systematic opposition to his Government, and to have treated as disaffected persons those whom, in favourite measures, he could not persuade by his arguments, nor influence by his example, and on points where every man has a right to judge for himself, and where authority has no legitimate right to interfere, much less to dictate.

To the charges confirmed by the statement of Mr. Bigge, Mr. Bennet adds, from the evidence collected by the Jail Committee, that the fees in the Governor's Court, collected by the authority of the Governor, are most exorbitant and oppressive; and that illegal taxes are collected under the sole authority of the Governor. It has been made, by colonial regulations, a capital offence to steal the wild cattle; and in 1816, three persons were convicted of stealing a wild bull, *the property of our Sovereign Lord the King.* Now, our Sovereign Lord the King (whatever be his other merits or demerits) is certainly a very good-natured man, and would be the first to lament that an unhappy convict was sentenced to death for killing one of his wild bulls on the other side of the world. The cases of Mr. Moore and of William Stewart, as quoted by Mr. Bennet, are very strong. If they are answerable, they should be answered. The concluding letter to Mr. Stewart is, to us, the most decisive proof of the unfitness of Colonel Macquarrie for the situation in which he was placed. The Ministry at home, after the authenticity of the letter was proved, should have seized upon the first decent pretext of recalling the Governor, of thanking him in the name of his Sovereign for his valuable services (not omitting his care of the wild bulls), and of dismissing him to half-pay — and insignificance.

As to the Trial by Jury, we cannot agree with Mr. Bennet, that it would be right to introduce it at present, for reasons we have given in a previous Article, and which we see no reason for altering. The time of course will come when it would be in the highest degree unjust and absurd, to refuse to that settlement the benefit of popular institutions. But they are too young, too few, and too deficient for such civilised machinery at present. "I cannot come to serve upon the jury — the waters of the Hawksbury are out, and I have a mile to swim — the kangaroos will break into my corn — the convicts have robbed me — my little boy has been bitten by an ornithorynchus paradoxus — I have sent a man fifty miles with a sack of flour to buy a pair of breeches for the assizes, and he is not returned." These are the excuses which, in new colonies, always prevent Trial by Jury; and make it desirable, for the first half century of their existence, that they should live under the simplicity and convenience of despotism—such modified despotism (we mean) as a British House of Commons (always containing men as bold and honest as the member for Shrewsbury) will permit in the governors of their distant colonies.

Such are the opinions formed of the conduct of Governor Macquarrie by Mr. Bigge. Not the slightest insinuation is made against the integrity of his character. Though almost every-

body else has a job, we do not perceive that any is imputed to this gentleman; but he is negligent, expensive, arbitrary, ignorant, and clearly deficient in abilities for the task committed to his charge. It is our decided opinion, therefore, that Mr. Bennet has rendered a valuable service to the public, in attacking and exposing his conduct. As a gentleman and an honest man, there is not the smallest charge against the Governor; but a gentleman, and a very honest man, may very easily ruin a very fine colony. The colony itself, disencumbered of Colonel Lachlan Macquarrie, will probably become a very fine empire; but we can scarcely believe it is of any present utility as a place of punishment. The history of emancipated convicts, who have made a great deal of money by their industry and their speculations, necessarily reaches this country, and prevents men who are goaded by want, and hovering between vice and virtue, from looking upon it as a place of suffering—perhaps leads them to consider it as the land of hope and refuge, to them unattainable, except by the commission of crime. And so they lift up their heads at the Bar, hoping to be transported,—

> "Stabant orantes primi transmittere cursum,
> Tendebantque manus, ripæ ulterioris amore."

It is not possible, in the present state of the law, that these enticing histories of convict prosperity should be prevented, by one uniform system of severity exercised in New South Wales, upon all transported persons. Such different degrees of guilt are included under the term of convict, that it would violate every feeling of humanity, and every principle of justice, to deal out one measure of punishment to all. We strongly suspect that this is the root of the evil. We want new gradations of guilt to be established by law—new names for those gradations—and a different measure of good and evil treatment attached to those denominations. In this manner, the mere *convict*, the *rogue and convict*, and the *incorrigible convict*, would expect, upon their landing, to be treated with very different degrees of severity. The first might be merely detained in New South Wales without labour or coercion; the second compelled, at all events, to work out two-thirds of his time, without the possibility of remission; and the third be destined at once for the Coal River.* If these consequences steadily followed these gradations of conviction, they would soon be understood by the felonious world at home. At present, the prosperity of the best convicts is considered to be attainable by all; and transportation to another hemisphere is looked upon as the renovation of fallen fortunes, and the passport to wealth and power.

Another circumstance, which destroys all idea of punishment in transportation to New South Wales, is the enormous expense which that settlement would occasion if it really were made a place of punishment. A little wicked tailor arrives, of no use to the architectural projects of the Governor. He is turned over to a settler, who leases this sartorial Borgia his liberty for five shillings per week, and allows him to steal and snip, what, when, and where he can. The excuse for all this mockery of law and justice is, that the expense of his maintenance is saved to the Government at home. But the expense is not saved to the country at large. The nefarious needleman writes home, that he is as comfortable as a finger in a thimble! that though a fraction only of humanity, he has several wives, and is filled every day with rum and kangaroo. This, of course, is not lost upon the shopboard; and, for the saving of fifteen pence per day, the foundation of many criminal tailors is laid. What is true of tailors, is true of tinkers and all other trades. The chances of escape from labour, and of manumission in the Bay, we may depend upon it, are accurately reported, and perfectly understood, in the flash-houses of St. Giles; and while Earl Bathurst is full of jokes and joy, public morals are thus sapped to their foundation.

* This practice is now resorted to.

GAME LAWS.

(E. Review, 1823.)

A Letter to the Chairman of the Committee of the House of Commons, on the Game Laws. By the Hon. and Rev. William Herbert. Ridgway. 1823.

About the time of the publication of this little pamphlet of Mr. Herbert, a Committee of the House of Commons published a Report on the Game Laws, containing a great deal of very curious information respecting the sale of game, an epitome of which we shall now lay before our readers. The country higglers who collect poultry, gather up the game from the depôts of the poachers, and transmit it in the same manner as poultry, and in the same packages, to the London poulterers, by whom it is distributed to the public; and this traffic is carried on (as far as game is concerned) even from the distance of Scotland. The same business is carried on by the porters of stage coaches; and a great deal of game is sold clandestinely by lords of manors, or by gamekeepers, without the knowledge of lords of manors; and principally, as the evidence states, from Norfolk and Suffolk, the great schools of steel traps and spring guns. The supply of game, too, is proved to be quite as regular as the supply of poultry; the number of hares and partridges supplied rather exceeds that of pheasants; but any description of game may be had to any amount. Here is a part of the evidence.

"Can you at any time procure any quantity of game? I have no doubt of it.—If you were to receive almost an unlimited order, could you execute it? Yes; I would supply the whole city of London, any fixed day once a week, all the year through, so that every individual inhabitant should have game for his table.—Do you think you could procure a thousand pheasants? Yes; I would be bound to produce *ten thousand* a week.—You would be bound to provide every family in London with a dish of game? Yes; a partridge, or a pheasant, or a hare, or a grouse, or something or other.—How would you set about doing it? I should, of course, request the persons with whom I am in the habit of dealing, to use their influence to bring me what they could by a certain day; I should speak to the dealers and the mail-guards, and coachmen, to produce a quantity; and I should send to my own connections in one or two manors where I have the privilege of selling for those gentlemen; and should send to Scotland to say, that every week the largest quantity they could produce was to be sent. Being but a petty salesman, I sell a very small quantity; but I have had about 4000 head direct from one man.—Can you state the quantity of game which has been sent to you during the year? No: I may say, perhaps, 10,000 head; mine is a limited trade; I speak comparatively to that of others; I only supply private families."—(*Report*, p. 20.)

Poachers who go out at night cannot, of course, like regular tradesmen, proportion the supply to the demand, but having once made a contract, they kill all they can; and hence it happens that the game market is sometimes very much overstocked, and great quantities of game either thrown away, or disposed of by Irish hawkers to the common people at very inferior prices.

"Does it ever happen to you to be obliged to dispose of poultry at the same low prices you are obliged to dispose of game? It depends upon the weather; often when there is a considerable quantity on hand, and, owing to the weather, it will not keep till the following day, I am obliged to take any price that is offered; but we can always turn either poultry or game into some price or other; and if it was not for the Irish hawkers, hundreds and hundreds of heads of game would be spoiled and thrown away. It is out of the power of any person to conceive for one moment the quantity of game that is hawked in the streets. I have had opportunity more than other persons of knowing this; for I have sold, I may say, more game than any other person in the city; and we serve hawkers indiscriminately, persons who come and purchase probably six fowls or turkeys and geese, and they will buy heads of game with them."—(*Report*, p. 22.)

Live birds are sent up as well as dead; eggs as well as birds. The price of pheasants' eggs last year was 8*s.* per dozen; of partridges' eggs, 2*s.* The price of hares was from 3*s.* to 5*s.* 6*d.*; of partridges, from 1*s.* 6*d.* to 2*s.* 6*d.*; of pheasants, from 5*s.* to 5*s.* 6*d.* each, and sometimes as low as 1*s.* 6*d.*

"What have you given for game this

year? It is very low indeed: I am sick of it; I do not think I shall ever deal again. We have got game this season as low as half-a-crown a brace (birds), and pheasants as low as 7*s.* a brace. It is so plentiful, there has been no end to spoiling it this season. It is so plentiful, it is of no use. In war time it was worth having; then they fetched 7*s.* and 8*s.* a brace." — (*Report*, p. 33.)

All the poulterers, too, even the most respectable, state, that it is absolutely necessary they should carry on this illegal traffic in the present state of the game laws; because their regular customers for poultry would infallibly leave any poulterer's shop from whence they could not be supplied with game.

"I have no doubt that it is the general wish at present of the trade not to deal in the article; but they are all, of course, compelled from their connections. If they cannot get game from one person they can from another.

"Do you believe that poulterers are not to be found who would take out licences, and would deal with those very persons, for the purposes of obtaining a greater profit than they would have dealing as you would do? I think the poulterers in general are a respectable set of men, and would not countenance such a thing; they feel now that they are driven into a corner; that there may be men who would countenance irregular proceedings, I have no doubt.—Would it be their interest to do so, considering the penalty? No, I think not. The poulterers are perfectly well aware that they are committing a breach of the law at present.—Do you suppose that those persons, respectable as they are, who are now committing a breach of the law, would not equally commit that breach if the law were altered? No, certainly not; at present it is so connected with their business that they cannot help it.—You said just now, that they were driven into a corner; what did you mean by that? We are obliged to aid and abet those men who commit those depredations, because of the constant demand for game, from different customers whom we supply with poultry.—Could you carry on your business as a poulterer, if you refused to supply game? By no means; because some of the first people in the land require it of me."—(*Report*, p. 15.)

When that worthy Errorist, Mr. Bankes, brought in his bill of additional severities against poachers, there was no man of sense and reflection who did not anticipate the following consequences of the measure:—

"Do you find that less game has been sold in consequence of the bill rendering it penal to sell game? Upon my word, it did not make the slightest difference in the world. — Not immediately after it was made? No; I do not think it made the slightest difference. — It did not make the slightest sensation? No; I never sold a bird less.—Was not there a resolution of the poulterers not to sell game? I was secretary to that committee. — What was the consequence of that resolution? A great deal of ill blood in the trade. One gentleman who just left the room did not come in to my ideas. I never had a head of game in my house; all my neighbours sold it; and as we had people on the watch, who were ready to watch it into the houses, it came to this, we were prepared to bring our actions against certain individuals, after sitting, perhaps, from three to four months, every week, which we did at the Crown and Anchor in the Strand; but we did not proceed with our actions, to prevent ill blood in the trade. We regularly met, and, as we conceived at the time, formed a committee of the most respectable of the trade. I was secretary of that committee. The game was sold in the city, in the vicinity of the Royal Exchange, cheaper than ever was known, because the people at our end of the town were afraid. I, as a point of honour, never had it in my house. I never had a head of game in my house that season.—What was the consequence? I lost my trade, and gave offence to gentlemen: a nobleman's steward, or butler, or cook, treated it as contumely; 'Good God! what is the use of your running your head against the wall?'—You were obliged to begin the trade again? Yes, and sold more than ever."—(*Report*, p. 18.)

These consequences are confirmed by the evidence of every person before the Committee.

All the evidence is very strong as to the fact, that dealing in game is not discreditable; that there are a great number of respectable persons, and, among the rest, the first poulterers in London, who buy game knowing it to have been illegally procured, but who would never dream of purchasing any other article procured by dishonesty.

"Are there not, to your knowledge, a great many people in this town who deal in

game, by buying or selling it, that would not on any account buy or sell stolen property? Certainly; there are many capital tradesmen, poulterers, who deal in game, that would have nothing to do with stolen property; and yet I do not think there is a poulterer's shop in London, where they could not get game, if they wanted it.—Do you think any discredit attaches to any man in this town for buying or selling game? I think none at all; and I do not think that the men to whom I have just referred would have anything to do with stolen goods.—Would it not, in the opinion of the inhabitants of London, be considered a very different thing dealing in stolen game or stolen poultry? Certainly.—The one would be considered disgraceful, and the other not? Certainly; they think nothing of dealing in game; and the farmers in the country will not give information; they will have a hare or two of the very men who work for them; and they are afraid to give information." — (*Report*, p. 31.)

The evidence of Daniel Bishop, one of the Bow Street officers, who has been a good deal employed in the apprehension of poachers, is curious and important, as it shows the enormous extent of the evil, and the ferocious spirit which the game laws engender in the common people. "The poachers," he says, "came sixteen miles. The whole of the village from which they were taken were poachers; the constable of the village, and the shoemaker, and other inhabitants of the village. I fetched one man twenty-two miles. There was the son of a respectable gardener; one of these was a sawyer, and another a baker, who kept a good shop there. If the village had been alarmed, we should have had some mischief; but we were all prepared with fire-arms. If poachers have a spite with the gamekeeper, that would induce them to go out in numbers to resist him. This party I speak of had something in their hats to distinguish them. They take a delight in setting-to with the gamekeepers; and talk it over afterwards how they served so and so. They fought with the butt-ends of their guns at Lord Howe's; they beat the gamekeepers shockingly."—"Does it occur to you (Bishop is asked) to have had more applications, and to have detected more persons this season than in any former one? Yes; I think within four months there have been twenty-one transported that I have been at the taking of, and through one man turning evidence in each case, and without that they could not have been identified; the gamekeepers could not, or would not, identify them. The poachers go to the public-house and spend their money; if they have a good night's work, they will go and get drunk with the money. The gangs are connected together at different public-houses, just like a club at a public-house; they are all sworn together. If the keeper took one of them, they would go and attack him for so doing."

Mr. Stafford, chief-clerk of Bow Street, says, "All the offences against the game laws which are of an atrocious description I think are generally reported to the public office in Bow Street, more especially in cases where the keepers have either been killed, or dangerously wounded, and the assistance of an officer from Bow Street is required. The applications have been much more numerous of late years* than they were formerly. Some of them have been cases of murder; but I do not think many have amounted to murder. There are many instances in which keepers have been very ill-treated — they have been wounded, skulls have been fractured, and bones broken; and they have been shot at. A man takes a hare, or a pheasant, with a very different feeling from that with which he would take a pigeon or a fowl out of a farm-yard. The number of persons that assemble together is more for the purpose of protecting themselves against those that may apprehend them, than from any idea that they are actually com-

* It is only of late years that men have been transported for shooting at night. There are instances of men who have been transported at the Sessions for night poaching, who made no resistance at all when taken; but then their characters as old poachers weighed against them—characters estimated probably by the very lords of manors who had lost their game. This disgraceful law is the occasion of all the murders committed for game.

mitting depredation upon the property of another person; they do not consider it as property. I think there is a sense of morality and a distinction of crime existing in the men's minds, although they are mistaken about it. Men feel that if they go in a great body together, to break into a house, or to rob a person, or to steal his poultry, or his sheep, they are committing a crime against that man's property; but I think with respect to the game, they do not feel that they are doing anything which is wrong: but think they have committed no crime when they have done the thing, and their only anxiety is to escape detection." In addition, Mr. Stafford states that he remembers not *one single conviction under Mr. Bankes's Act against buying game*; and not one conviction for buying or selling game within the last year has been made at Bow Street.

The inferences from these facts are exactly as we predicted, and as every man of common sense must have predicted—that to prevent the sale of game is absolutely impossible. If game be plentiful, and cannot be obtained at any lawful market, an illicit trade will be established, which it is utterly impossible to prevent by any increased severity of the laws. There never was a more striking illustration of the necessity of attending to public opinion in all penal enactments. Mr. Bankes (a perfect representative of all the ordinary notions about forcing mankind by pains and penalties) took the floor. To buy a partridge (though still considered as inferior to murder) was visited with the very heaviest infliction of the law; and yet, though game is sold as openly in London as apples and oranges, though three years have elapsed since this legislative mistake, the officers of the police can hardly recollect a single instance where the information has been laid, or the penalty levied; and why? because every man's feelings and every man's understanding tell him, that it is a most absurd and ridiculous tyranny to prevent one man, who has more game than he wants, from exchanging it with another man, who has more money than he wants—because magistrates will not (if they can avoid it) inflict such absurd penalties—because even common informers know enough of the honest indignation of mankind, and are too well aware of the coldness of pump and pond, to act under the bill of the Lycurgus of Corfe Castle.

The plan now proposed is, to undersell the poacher, which may be successful or unsuccessful; but the threat is, if you attempt this plan there will be no game—and if there is no game there will be no country gentlemen. We deny every part of this enthymeme—the last proposition as well as the first. We really cannot believe that all our rural mansions would be deserted, although no game was to be found in their neighbourhood. Some come into the country for health, some for quiet, for agriculture, for economy, from attachment to family estates, from love of retirement, from the necessity of keeping up provincial interests, and from a vast variety of causes. Partridges and pheasants, though they form nine-tenths of human motives, still leave a small residue, which may be classed under some other head. Neither are a great proportion of those whom the love of shooting brings into the country of the smallest value or importance to the country. A Colonel of the Guards, the second son just entered at Oxford, three diners out from Piccadilly—Major Rock, Lord John, Lord Charles, the Colonel of the regiment quartered at the neighbouring town, two Irish Peers, and a German Baron;—if all this honourable company proceed with fustian jackets, dog-whistles, and chemical inventions, to a solemn destruction of pheasants, how is the country benefited by their presence? or how would earth, air, or sea, be injured by their annihilation? There are certainly many valuable men brought into the country by a love of shooting, who, coming there for that purpose, are useful for many better purposes; but a vast multitude of shooters are of no more service to the country than the ramrod which condenses the charge, or

the barrel which contains it. We do not deny that the annihilation of the game laws would thin the aristocratical population of the country; but it would not thin that population so much as is contended; and the loss of many of the persons so banished would be a good rather than a misfortune. At all events, we cannot at all comprehend the policy of alluring the better classes of society into the country, by the temptation of petty tyranny and injustice, or of monopoly in sports. How absurd it would be to offer to the higher orders the exclusive use of peaches, nectarines, and apricots, as the premium of rustication—to put vast quantities of men into prison as apricot eaters, apricot buyers, and apricot sellers—to appoint a regular day for beginning to eat, and another for leaving off—to have a lord of the manor for green gages—and to rage with a penalty of five pounds against the unqualified eater of the gage! And yet the privilege of shooting a set of wild poultry is stated to be the bonus for the residence of country gentlemen. As far as this immense advantage can be obtained without the sacrifice of justice and reason, well and good—but we would not oppress any order of society, or violate right and wrong, to obtain any population of squires, however dense. It is the grossest of all absurdities to say the present state of the law is absurd and unjust, but it must not be altered, because the alteration would drive gentlemen out of the country! If gentlemen cannot breathe fresh air without injustice, let them putrefy in Cranborne Alley. Make just laws, and let squires live and die where they please.

The evidence collected in the House of Commons respecting the Game Laws is so striking and so decisive against the gentlemen of the trigger, that their only resource is to represent it as not worthy of belief. But why not worthy of belief? It is not stated what part of it is incredible. Is it the plenty of game in London for sale? the infrequency of convictions? the occasional but frequent excess of supply above demand in an article supplied by stealing; or its destruction when the sale is not without risk, and the price extremely low? or the readiness of grandees to turn the excess of their game into fish or poultry? All these circumstances appear to us so natural and so likely, that we should, without any evidence, have had little doubt of their existence. There are a few absurdities in the evidence of one of the poulterers; but, with this exception, we see no reason whatever for impugning the credibility and exactness of the mass of testimony prepared by the Committee.

It is utterly impossible to teach the common people to respect property in animals bred the possessor knows not where—which he cannot recognise by any mark, which may leave him the next moment, which are kept, not for his profit, but for his amusement. Opinion never will be in favour of such property: if the *animus furandi* exists, the propensity will be gratified by poaching. It is in vain to increase the severity of the protecting laws. They make the case weaker instead of stronger; and are more resisted and worse executed, exactly in proportion as they are contrary to public opinion:—the case of the game laws is a memorable lesson upon the philosophy of legislation. If a certain degree of punishment does not cure the offence, it is supposed by the Bankes' School, that there is nothing to be done but to multiply this punishment by two, and then again and again, till the object is accomplished. The efficient maximum of punishment, however, is not what the Legislature chooses to enact, *but what the great mass of mankind think the maximum ought to be.* The moment the punishment passes this Rubicon, it becomes less and less, instead of greater and greater. Juries and Magistrates will not commit—informers* are afraid of public indig-

* There is a remarkable instance of this in the new Turnpike Act. The penalty for taking more than the legal number of outside passengers is ten pounds per head, if the coachman is in part or wholly the owner. This will rarely be levied; because it is too much. A penalty of 100*l.* would produce perfect impunity. The maximum of prac-

nation—poachers will not submit to be sent to Botany Bay without a battle—blood is shed for pheasants—the public attention is called to this preposterous state of the law—and even ministers (whom nothing pesters so much as the interests of humanity) are at last compelled to come forward and do what is right. Apply this to the game laws. It was before penal to sell game: within these few years it has been made penal to buy it. From the scandalous cruelty of the law, night poachers are transported for seven years. And yet, never was so much game sold, or such a spirit of ferocious resistance excited to the laws. One fourth of all the commitments in Great Britain are for offences against the game laws. There is a general feeling that some alteration *must* take place—a feeling not only among Reviewers, who never see nor eat game, but among the double-barrelled, shot-belted members of the House of Commons, who are either alarmed or disgusted by the vice and misery which their cruel laws and childish passion for amusement are spreading among the lower orders of mankind.

It is said, "In spite of all the game sold, there is game enough left; let the laws therefore remain as they are;" and so it was said formerly, "There is sugar enough; let the slave trade remain as it is." But at what expense of human happiness is this quantity of game or of sugar, and this state of poacher law and slave law to remain! The first object of a good government is not that rich men should have their pleasures in perfection, but that all orders of men should be good and happy; and if crowded covies and chuckling cock-pheasants are only to be procured by encouraging the common people in vice, and leading them into cruel and disproportionate punishment, it is the duty of the Government to restrain the cruelties which the country members, in reward for their assiduous loyalty, have been allowed to introduce into the game laws.

The plan of the new bill (long since anticipated, in all its provisions, by the acute author of the pamphlet before us), is, that the public at large should be supplied by persons licensed by magistrates, and that all qualified persons should be permitted to sell their game to these licensed distributors; and there seems a fair chance that such a plan would succeed. The questions are, Would sufficient game come into the hands of the licensed salesman? Would the licensed salesman confine himself to the purchase of game from qualified persons? Would buyers of game purchase elsewhere than from the licensed salesmen? Would the poacher be undersold by the honest dealer? Would game remain in the same plenty as before? It is understood that the game laws are to remain as they are; with this only difference, that the qualified man can sell to the licensed man, and the licentiate to the public.

It seems probable to us, that vast quantities of game would, after a little time, find their way into the hands of licensed poulterers. Great people are very often half eaten up by their establishments. The quantity of game killed in a large shooting party is very great: to eat it is impossible, and to dispose of it in presents very troublesome. The preservation of game is very expensive; and, when it could be bought, it would be no more a compliment to send it as a present than it would be to send geese and fowls. If game were sold, very large shooting establishments might be made to pay their own expenses. The shame is made by the law; there is a disgrace in being detected and fined. If that barrier were removed, superfluous partridges would go to the poulterers as readily as superfluous venison does to the venison butcher—or as a gentleman sells the corn and mutton off his farm which he cannot consume. For these reasons, we do not doubt that the shops of licensed poulterers would be full of game in the season; and this part of the argument, we think, the arch-

tical severity would have been about five pounds. Any magistrate would cheerfully levy this sum; while doubling it will produce reluctance in the Judge, resistance in the culprit, and unwillingness in the informer.

enemy, Sir John Shelley, himself would concede to us.

The next question is, From whence would they procure it? A licence for selling game, granted by country magistrates, would, from their jealousy upon these subjects, be granted only to persons of some respectability and property. The purchase of game from unqualified persons would, of course, be guarded against by very heavy penalties, both personal and pecuniary; and these penalties would be inflicted, because opinion would go with them. "Here is a respectable tradesman," it would be said, "who might have bought as much game as he pleased in a lawful manner, but who, in order to increase his profits by buying it a little cheaper, has encouraged a poacher to steal it." Public opinion, therefore, would certainly be in favour of a very strong punishment; and a licensed vendor of game, who exposed himself to these risks, would expose himself to the loss of liberty, property, character, and licence. The persons interested to put a stop to such a practice, would not be the paid agents of Government, as in cases of smuggling; but all the gentlemen of the country, the customers of the tradesmen for fish, poultry, or whatever else he dealt in, would have an interest in putting down the practice. In all probability, the practice would become disreputable, like the purchase of stolen poultry; and this would be a stronger barrier than the strongest laws. There would, of course, be some exceptions to this statement. A few shabby people would, for the chance of gaining sixpence, incur the risk of ruin and disgrace; but it is probable that the general practice would be otherwise.

For the same reasons, the consumers of game would rather give a little more for it to a licensed poulterer, than expose themselves to severe penalties by purchasing from poachers. The great mass of London consumers are supplied now, not from shabby people, in whom they can have no confidence — not from hawkers and porters, but from respectable tradesmen, in whose probity they have the most perfect confidence Men will brave the law for pheasants, but not for sixpence or a shilling; and the law itself is much more difficult to be braved, when it allows pheasants to be bought at some price, than when it endeavours to render them utterly inaccessible to wealth. All the licensed salesmen, too, would have a direct interest in stopping the contraband trade of game. They would lose no character in doing so; their informations would be reasonable and respectable.

If all this be true, the poacher would have to compete with a great mass of game fairly and honestly poured into the market. He would be selling with a rope about his neck, to a person who bought with a rope about his neck; his description of customers would be much the same as the customers for stolen poultry, and his profits would be very materially abridged. At present, the poacher is in the same situation as the smuggler would be, if rum and brandy could not be purchased of any fair trader. The great check to the profits of the smuggler are, that, if you want his commodities, and will pay a higher price, you may have them elsewhere without the risk of disgrace. But forbid the purchase of these luxuries at any price. Shut up the shop of the brandy merchant, and you render the trade of the smuggler of incalculable value. The object of the intended bill is, to raise up precisely the same competition to the trade of the poacher, by giving the public an opportunity of buying lawfully and honestly the tempting articles in which he now deals exclusively. Such an improvement would not, perhaps, altogether annihilate his trade; but it would, in all probability, act as a very material check upon it.

The predominant argument against all this is, that the existing prohibition against buying game, though partially violated, does deter many persons from coming into the market; that if this prohibition were removed, the demand for game would be increased, the legal supply would be insufficient, and the residue would, and must be, supplied by the poacher, whose trade would, for these reasons, be as lucrative and flourishing as before. But it is

only a few years since the purchase of game has been made illegal; and the market does not appear to have been at all narrowed by the prohibition; not one head of game the less has been sold by the poulterers; and scarcely one single conviction has taken place under that law. How, then, would the removal of the prohibition, and the alteration of the law, extend the market, and increase the demand, when the enactment of the prohibition has had no effect in narrowing it? But if the demand increases, why not the legal supply also? Game is increased upon an estate by feeding them in winter, by making some abatement to the tenants for guarding against depredations, by a large apparatus of game-keepers and spies — in short by expense. But if this pleasure of shooting, so natural to country gentlemen, be made to pay its own expenses, by sending superfluous game to market, more men, it is reasonable to suppose, will thus preserve and augment their game. The love of pleasure and amusement will produce in the owners of game that desire to multiply game, which the love of gain does in the farmer to multiply poultry. Many gentlemen of small fortune will remember, that they cannot enjoy to any extent this pleasure without this resource; that the legal sale of game will discountenance poaching; and they will open an account with the poulterer, not to get richer, but to enjoy a great pleasure without an expense, in which, upon other terms, they could not honourably and conscientiously indulge. If country gentlemen of moderate fortune will do this (and we think after a little time they will do it), game may be multiplied and legally supplied to any extent. Another keeper, and another bean-stack, will produce their proportional supply of pheasants. The only reason why the great lord has more game per acre than the little squire, is, that he spends more money per acre to preserve it.

For these reasons, we think the experiment of legalising the sale of game ought to be tried. The game laws have been carried to a pitch of oppression which is a disgrace to the country. The prisons are half filled with peasants shut up for the irregular slaughter of rabbits and birds — a sufficient reason for killing a weasel, but not for imprisoning a man. Something should be done; it is disgraceful to a Government to stand by, and see such enormous evils without interference. It is true, they are not connected with the struggles of party: but still, the happiness of the common people, whatever gentlemen may say, ought every now and then to be considered.

CRUEL TREATMENT OF UNTRIED PRISONERS.

(E. Review, 1824.)

1. *A Letter to the Right Honourable Robert Peel, one of His Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State, &c. &c. &c. on Prison Labour.* By John Headlam, M.A., Chairman of the Quarter Sessions for the North Riding of the County of York. London, Hatchard and Son. 1823.
2. *Information and Observations, respecting the proposed Improvements at York Castle.* Printed by Order of the Committee of Magistrates, September, 1823.

It has been the practice all over England, for these last fifty years*, not to *compel* prisoners to work before guilt was proved. Within these last three or four years, however, the magistrates of the North Riding of Yorkshire, considering it improper to support any idle person at the county expense, have resolved, that prisoners committed to the House of Correction for trial, and requiring county support, should work for their livelihood; and no sooner was the tread-mill brought into fashion, than that machine was adopted in the North Riding as the species of labour by which such prisoners were to earn their maintenance. If these magistrates did not consider themselves empowered to burden the county rates for the support of prisoners before trial, who would not contribute to support themselves, it does not appear, from the publication of the Reverend Chairman of the Sessions,

* Headlam, p. 6.

that any opinions of Counsel were taken as to the legality of so putting prisoners to work, or of refusing them maintenance if they choose to be idle; but the magistrates themselves decided that such was the law of the land. Thirty miles off, however, the law of the land was differently interpreted; and in the Castle of York large sums were annually expended in the maintenance of idle prisoners before trial, and paid by the different Ridings, without remonstrance or resistance.*

Such was the state of affairs in the county of York before the enactment of the recent prison bill. After that period, enlargements and alterations were necessary in the county jail; and it was necessary also for these arrangements, that the magistrates should know whether or not they were authorised to maintain such prisoners at the expense of the county, as, being accounted able and unwilling to work, still claimed the county allowance. To questions proposed upon these points to three barristers the following answers were returned:—

"2ndly, I am of opinion, that the magistrates are empowered, and are compelled to maintain, at the expense of the county, such prisoners *before* trial as are able to work, unable to maintain themselves, and not willing to work; and that they have not the power of compelling such prisoners to work, either at the tread-mill, or any other species of labour.

"J. GURNEY.

"*Lincoln's Inn Fields, 2nd September, 1823.*"

"I think the magistrates are empowered, under the tenth section (explained by the 37th and 38th) to maintain prisoners before trial, who are able to work, unable to maintain themselves by their own means, or by employment which they themselves can procure, and not willing to work; and I think also, that the words 'shall be lawful,' in that section, do not leave them a discretion on the subject, but are compulsory. *Such* prisoners can only be employed in prison labour with *their own consent;* and it cannot be intended that the Justices may force such consent by withholding from them the necessaries of life, if they do not give it. Even those who are convicted cannot be employed at the tread-mill, which I consider as a species of *severe* labour.

"J. PARKE.

"*September 4th*, 1823."

"2ndly, As to the point of compelling prisoners confined on criminal charges; and receiving relief from the magistrates, to reasonable labour; to that of the tread-mill, for instance, in which, when properly conducted, there is nothing severe or unreasonable; had the question arisen prior to the late Act, I should with confidence have said, I thought the magistrates had a compulsory power in this respect. Those who cannot live without relief in a jail, cannot live without labour out of it. Labour then is their avocation. Nothing is so injurious to the morals and habits of the prisoner as the indolence prevalent in prisons; nothing so injurious to good order in the prison. The analogy between this and other cases of public support is exceedingly strong; one may almost consider it a general principle that those who live at the charge of the community shall, as far as they are able, give the community a compensation through their labour. But the question does not depend on mere abstract reasoning. The stat. 19 Ch. 2. c. 4. sect. 1. entitled, an 'Act for Relief of poor Prisoners, and setting them on work,' speaks of persons committed for felony and other misdemeanours to the common jail who many times *perish before trial;* and then proceeds as to setting poor prisoners on work. Then stat. 31 G. 3. c. 46. sect. 13. orders money to be raised for such prisoners of every description, as, being confined within the said jails, or other places of confinement, *are not able to work.* A late stat. (52 G. 3. c. 160.) orders parish relief to such debtors on mesne process in jails, not county jails, as are not able to support themselves; but says nothing of finding or compelling work. Could it be doubted, that if the Justices were to provide work, and the prisoner refused it, such debtors might, like any other parish paupers, be refused the relief mentioned by the statute? In all the above cases, the authority to insist on the prisoner's labour, as the condition and consideration of relief granted him, is, I think, either expressed or necessarily implied: and, thus viewing the subject, I think it was in the power of magistrates

* We mention the case of the North Riding, to convince our readers that the practice of condemning prisoners to work before trial has existed in some parts of England; for in questions like this we have always found it more difficult to prove the existence of the facts, than to prove that they were mischievous and unjust.

prior to the late statute, to compel prisoners, subsisting in all or in part on public relief, to work at the tread-mill. The objection commonly made is, that prisoners, prior to trial, are to be accounted innocent, and to be detained, merely that they may be secured for trial; to this the answer is obvious, that the labour is neither meant as a punishment, or a disgrace, but simply as a compensation for the relief, at their own request, afforded them. Under the present statute, I, however, have no doubt that poor prisoners are entitled to public support, and that there can be no compulsory labour prior to trial. The two statutes adverted to (19 Ch. 2. c. 4. and 31 G. 3.) are, as far as this subject is concerned, expressly repealed. The Legislature then had in contemplation the existing power of magistrates to order labour before trial, and having it in contemplation, repeals it; substituting (sect. 38.) a power of setting to labour *only sentenced persons*. The 13th rule, too, (p. 777.) speaks of labour as connected with convicted prisoners, and sect. 37. speaks in general terms of persons committed for trial, as labouring with their own consent. In opposition to these clauses, I think it impossible to speak of implied power, or power founded on general reasoning or analogy. So strong, however, are the arguments in favour of a more extended authority in Justices of the Peace, that it is scarcely to be doubted, that Parliament, on a calm revision of the subject, would be willing to restore, in a more distinct manner than it has hitherto been enacted, a general discretion on the subject. Were this done, there is one observation I will venture to make, which is, that should some unfortunate association of ideas render the tread-mill a matter of ignominy to common feelings, an enlightened magistracy would scarcely compel an untried prisoner to a species of labour which would disgrace him in his own mind, and in that of the public.

"S. W. NICOLL.

"*York, August 27th*, 1823."

In consequence, we believe, of these opinions, the North Riding magistrates, on the 13th of October (the new bill commencing on the 1st of September), passed the following resolution: — "That persons committed for trial, who are able to work, and have the means of employment offered them by the visiting magistrates, by which they may earn their support, but who obstinately refuse to work, shall be allowed bread and water only."

By this resolution they admit, of course, that the counsel are right in their interpretation of the present law; and that magistrates are forced to maintain prisoners before trial who do not choose to work. The magistrates say, however, by their resolution, that the food shall be of the plainest and humblest kind, bread and water; meaning, of course, that such prisoners should have a sufficient quantity of bread and water, or otherwise the evasion of the law would be in the highest degree mean and reprehensible. But it is impossible to suppose any such thing to be intended by gentlemen so highly respectable. Their intention is not that idle persons before trial shall starve, but that they shall have barely enough of the plainest food for the support of life and health.

Mr. Headlam has written a pamphlet to show that the old law was very reasonable and proper; that it is quite right that prisoners before trial, who are able to support themselves, but unwilling to work, should be compelled to work, and at the tread-mill, or that all support should be refused them. We are entirely of an opposite opinion: and maintain that it is neither legal nor expedient to *compel* prisoners before trial to work at the tread-mill, or at any species of labour, and that those who refuse to work should be supported upon a plain healthy diet. We impute no sort of blame to the magistrates of the North Riding, or to Mr. Headlam, their Chairman. We have no doubt but that they thought their measures the wisest and the best for correcting evil, and that they adopted them in pursuance of what they thought to be their duty. Nor do we enter into any discussion with Mr. Headlam, as Chairman of a Quarter Sessions, but as the writer of a pamphlet. It is only in his capacity of author that we have anything to do with him. In answering the arguments of Mr. Headlam, we shall notice at the same time, a few other observations commonly resorted to in defence of a system which we believe to be extremely pernicious, and pregnant with the worst consequences; and so thinking, we contend against it,

and in support of the law as it now stands.

We will not dispute with Mr. Headlam, whether his exposition of the old law be right or wrong; because time cannot be more unprofitably employed than in hearing gentlemen who are not lawyers discuss points of law. We dare to say Mr. Headlam knows as much of the laws of his country as magistrates in general do; but he will pardon us for believing, that for the moderate sum of three guineas a much better opinion of what the law is now, or was then, can be purchased, than it is in the power of Mr. Headlam or of any county magistrate, to give for nothing—*Cuilibet in arte sua credendum est.* It is concerning the expediency of such laws, and upon that point alone, that we are at issue with Mr. Headlam; and do not let this gentleman suppose it to be any answer to our remarks to state what is done in the prison in which he is concerned, now the law is altered. The question is, whether he is right or wrong in his reasoning upon what the law *ought* to be; we wish to hold out such reasoning to public notice, and think it important it should be refuted—doubly important when it comes from an author, the leader of the Quorum, who may say with the pious Æneas,—

> ——Quæque ipse miserrima vidi,
> Et *quorum* pars magna fui.

If, in this discussion, we are forced to insist upon the plainest and most elementary truths, the fault is not with us, but with those who forget them; and who refuse to be any longer restrained by those principles which have hitherto been held to be as clear as they are important to human happiness.

To begin, then, with the nominative case and the verb—we must remind those advocates for the treadmill, *a parte ante* (for with the millers *a parte post* we have no quarrel), that it is one of the oldest maxims of common sense, common humanity, and common law, to consider every man as innocent till he is proved to be guilty; and not only to consider him to be innocent, but to treat him as if he were so; to exercise upon his case not merely a barren speculation, but one which produces practical effects, and which secures to a prisoner the treatment of an honest, unpunished man. Now, to compel prisoners before trial to work at the treadmill, as the condition of their support, must, in a great number of instances, operate as a very severe punishment. A prisoner may be a tailor, a watchmaker, a bookbinder, a printer, totally unaccustomed to any such species of labour. Such a man may be cast into jail at the end of August*, and not tried till the March following; is it no punishment to such a man to walk up hill like a turnspit dog, in an infamous machine, for six months? and yet there are gentlemen who suppose that the common people do not consider this as punishment!—that the gayest and most joyous of human beings is a treader, untried by a jury of his countrymen, in the fifth month of lifting up the leg, and striving against the law of gravity, supported by the glorious information which he receives from the turnkey, that he has all the time been grinding flour on the other side of the wall! If this sort of exercise, necessarily painful to sedentary persons, is agreeable to persons accustomed to labour, then make it voluntary—give the prisoners their choice—give more money and more diet to those who can and will labour at the tread-mill, if the tread-mill (now so dear to magistrates) is a proper punishment for untried prisoners. The position we are contending against is, that all poor prisoners who are able to work should be put to work upon the tread-mill, the inevitable consequence of which practice is, a repetition of gross injustice by the infliction of undeserved punishment; for punishment, and severe punishment, to such persons as we have enumerated, we must consider it to be.

* Mr. Headlam, as we understand him, would extend this labour to all poor prisoners before trial, in jails which are delivered twice a year at the Assizes, as well as to Houses of Correction delivered four times a year at the Sessions; *i.e.* not extend the labour, but refuse all support to those who refuse the labour—a distinction, but not a difference.

But punishments are not merely to be estimated by pain to the limbs, but by the feelings of the mind. Gentlemen punishers are sometimes apt to forget that the common people have any mental feelings at all, and think, if body and belly are attended to, that persons under a certain income have no right to likes and dislikes. The labour of the tread-mill is irksome, dull, monotonous, and disgusting to the last degree. A man does not see his work, does not know what he is doing, what progress he is making; there is no room for art, contrivance, ingenuity, and superior skill—all which are the cheering circumstances of human labour. The husbandman sees the field gradually subdued by the plough; the smith beats the rude mass of iron by degrees into its meditated shape, and gives it a meditated utility; the tailor accommodates his parallelogram of cloth to the lumps and bumps of the human body, and, holding it up, exclaims, "This will contain the lower moiety of a human being." But the treader does nothing but tread; he sees no change of objects, admires no new relation of parts, imparts no new qualities to matter, and gives to it no new arrangements and positions; or, if he does, he sees and knows it not, but is turned at once from a rational being, by a justice of peace, into a *primum mobile*, and put upon a level with a rush of water or a puff of steam. It is impossible to get gentlemen to attend to the distinction between raw and roasted prisoners, without which all discussion on prisoners is perfectly ridiculous. Nothing can be more excellent than this kind of labour for persons to whom you mean to make labour as irksome as possible; but for this very reason, it is the labour to which an untried prisoner ought not to be put.

It is extremely uncandid to say that a man is obstinately and incorrigibly idle, because he will not submit to such tiresome and detestable labour as that of the tread-mill. It is an old feeling among Englishmen that there is a difference between tried and untried persons, between accused and convicted persons. These old opinions were in fashion before this new magistrate's plaything was invented; and we are convinced that many industrious persons, feeling that they have not had their trial, and disgusted with the nature of the labour, would refuse to work at the tread-mill, who would not be averse to join in any common and fair occupation. Mr. Headlam says, that labour may be a privilege as well as a punishment. So may taking physic be a privilege, in cases where it is asked for as a charitable relief, but not if it is stuffed down a man's throat whether he say yea or nay. Certainly labour is not necessarily a punishment: nobody has said it is so; but Mr. Headlam's labour is a punishment, because it is irksome, infamous, unasked for, and undeserved. This gentleman however observes, that committed persons *have offended the laws;* and the sentiment expressed in these words is the true key to his pamphlet and his system—a perpetual tendency to confound the convicted and the accused.

"With respect to those sentenced to labour as a punishment, I apprehend there is no difference of opinion. All are agreed that it is a great defect in any prison where such convicts are unemployed. But as to all *other* prisoners, whether debtors, *persons committed for trial*, or convicts not sentenced to hard labour, if they have no means of subsisting themselves, and must, if discharged, either labour for their livelihood or apply for parochial relief; it seems unfair to society at large, and especially to those who maintain themselves by honest industry, that those who, *by offending the laws, have subjected themselves to imprisonment*, should be lodged, and clothed, and fed, without being called upon for the same exertions which others have to use to obtain such advantages."—(*Headlam*, pp. 23, 24.)

Now nothing can be more unfair than to say that such men have offended the laws. That is the very question to be tried, whether they have offended the laws or not? It is merely because this little circumstance is taken for granted, that we have any quarrel at all with Mr. Headlam and his school.

"I can make," says Mr. Headlam, "every delicate consideration for the rare case of a person perfectly innocent being committed

to jail on suspicion of crime. Such person is deservedly an object of compassion, for having fallen under circumstances which subject him to be charged with crime, and, consequently, to be deprived of his liberty: but if he has been in the habit of labouring for his bread before his commitment, there does not appear to be any addition to his misfortune in being called upon to work for his subsistence in prison."—(*Headlam*, p. 24.)

And yet Mr. Headlam describes this very punishment, which does not add to the misfortunes of an innocent man, to be *generally disagreeable, to be dull, irksome, to excite a strong dislike, to be a dull, monotonous labour, to be a contrivance which connects the idea of discomfort with a jail* (p. 36.). So that Mr. Headlam looks upon it to be no increase of an innocent man's misfortunes, to be constantly employed upon a dull, irksome, monotonous labour, which excites a strong dislike, and connects the idea of discomfort with a jail. We cannot stop, or stoop to consider, whether beating hemp is more or less dignified than working in a mill. The simple rule is this,—whatever felons do, men not yet proved to be felons should not be compelled to do. It is of no use to look into laws become obsolete by alteration of manners. For these fifty years past, and before the invention of tread-mills, untried men were not put upon felons' work; but with the mill came in the mischief. Mr. Headlam asks, How can men be employed upon the ancient trades in a prison?—certainly they cannot; but are human occupations so few, and is the ingenuity of magistrates and jailers so limited, that no occupations can be found for innocent men, but those which are shameful and odious? Does Mr. Headlam really believe, that grown up and baptized persons are to be satisfied with such arguments, or repelled by such difficulties.

It is some compensation to an acquitted person, that the labour he has gone through unjustly in jail has taught him some trade, given him an insight into some species of labour in which he may hereafter improve himself; but Mr. Headlam's prisoner, after a verdict of acquittal, has learnt no other art than that of walking up hill; he has nothing to remember or recompense him but three months of undeserved and unprofitable torment. The verdict of the Jury has pronounced him steady in his morals; the conduct of the Justices has made him stiff in his joints.

But it is next contended by some persons, that the poor prisoner is not compelled to work, because he has the alternative of starving if he refuses to work. You take up a poor man upon suspicion, deprive him of all his usual methods of getting his livelihood, and then giving him the first view of the tread-mill, he of the Quorum thus addresses him:—"My amiable friend, we use no compulsion with untried prisoners. You are free as air till you are found guilty; only it is my duty to inform you, as you have no money of your own, that the disposition to eat and drink which you have allowed you sometimes feel, and upon which I do not mean to cast any degree of censure, cannot possibly be gratified but by constant grinding in this machine. It has its inconveniences, I admit; but balance them against the total want of meat and drink, and decide for yourself. You are perfectly at liberty to make your choice, and I by no means wish to influence your judgment." But Mr. Nicoll has a curious remedy for all this miserable tyranny; he says it is not meant as a punishment. But if I am conscious that I never have committed the offence, certain that I have never been found guilty of it, and find myself tost into the middle of an infernal machine, by the folly of those who do not know how to use the power intrusted to them, is it any consolation to me to be told, that it is not *intended* as a punishment, that it is a lucubration of Justices, a new theory of prison-discipline, a valuable county experiment going on at the expense of my arms, legs, back, feelings, character, and rights? We must tie those prægustant punishers down by one question. Do you mean to inflict any degree of punishment upon persons merely for being suspected?—or at least any other degree of punishment than that without which

criminal justice cannot exist, detention? If you do, why let any one out upon bail? For the question between us is not, how suspected persons are to be treated, and whether or not they are to be punished; but how suspected *poor* persons are to be treated, who want county support in prison. If to be suspected is deserving of punishment, then no man ought to be let out upon bail, but *every one* should be kept grinding from accusation to trial; and so ought *all* prisoners to be treated for offences not bailable, and who do not want the county allowance. And yet no grinding philosopher contends, that all suspected persons should be put in the mill—but only those who are too poor to find bail, or buy provisions.

If there are, according to the doctrines of the millers, to be two punishments, the first for being suspected of committing the offence, and the second for committing it, there should be two trials as well as two punishments. Is the man really suspected, or do his accusers only pretend to suspect him? Are the suspecting of better character than the suspected? Is it a light suspicion which may be atoned for by grinding a peck a day? Is it a bushel case? or is it one deeply criminal, which requires the flour to be ground fine enough for French rolls? But we must put an end to such absurdities.

It is very untruly stated, that a prisoner, before trial, not compelled to work, and kept upon a plain diet, merely sufficient to maintain him in health, is better off than he was previous to his accusation; and it is asked, with a triumphant leer, whether the situation of any man ought to be improved, merely because he has become an object of suspicion to his fellow-creatures? This happy and fortunate man, however, is separated from his wife and family; his liberty is taken away; he is confined within four walls; he has the reflection that his family are existing upon a precarious parish support, that his little trade and property are wasting, that his character has become infamous, that he has incurred ruin by the malice of others, or by his own crimes, that in a few weeks he is to forfeit his life, or be banished from everything he loves upon earth. This is the improved situation, and the redundant happiness which requires the penal circumvolutions of the Justice's mill to cut off so unjust a balance of gratification, and bring him a little nearer to what he was before imprisonment and accusation. It would be just as reasonable to say, that an idle man in a fever is better off than a healthy man who is well and earns his bread. He may be better off if you look to the idleness alone, though that is doubtful; but is he better off if all the aches, agonies, disturbances, deliriums, and the nearness to death, are added to the lot?

Mr. Headlam's panacea for all prisoners before trial, is the tread-mill: we beg his pardon—for all *poor* prisoners; but a man who is about to be tried for his life, often wants all his leisure time to reflect upon his defence. The exertions of every man within the walls of a prison are necessarily crippled and impaired. What can a prisoner answer who is taken hot and reeking from the tread-mill, and asked what he has to say in his defence? his answer naturally is—"I have been grinding corn instead of thinking of my defence, and have never been allowed the proper leisure to think of protecting my character and my life." This is a very strong feature of cruelty and tyranny in the mill. We ought to be sure that every man has had the fullest leisure to prepare for his defence, that his mind and body have not been harassed by vexatious and compulsory employment. The public purchase, at a great price, legal accuracy, and legal talent, to accuse a man who has not, perhaps, one shilling to spend upon his defence. It is atrocious cruelty not to leave him full leisure to write his scarcely legible letters to his witnesses, and to use all the melancholy and feeble means which suspected poverty can employ for its defence against the long and heavy arm of power.

A prisoner, upon the system recommended by Mr. Headlam, is committed, perhaps at the end of August, and

brought to trial the March following; and, after all, the bill is either thrown out by the grand jury, or the prisoner is fully acquitted; and it has been found, we believe, by actual returns, that, of committed prisoners, about a half are actually acquitted, or their accusations dismissed by the grand jury. This may be very true, say the advocates of this system, but we know that many men who are acquitted are guilty. They escape through some mistaken lenity of the law, or some corruption of evidence; and as they have not had their deserved punishment after trial, we are not sorry they had it before. The English law says, better many guilty escape, than that one innocent man perish; but the humane notions of the mill are bottomed upon the principle, that all had better be punished lest any escape. They evince a total mistrust in the jurisprudence of the country, and say the results of trial are so uncertain, that it is better to punish all the prisoners before they come into Court. Mr. Headlam forgets that general rules are not beneficial in each individual instance, but beneficial upon the whole; that they are preserved because they do much more good than harm, though in some particular instances they do more harm than good; yet no respectable man violates them on that account, but holds them sacred for the great balance of advantage they confer upon mankind. It is one of the greatest crimes, for instance, to take away the life of a man; yet there are many men whose death would be a good to society, rather than an evil. Every good man respects the property of others; yet to take from a worthless miser, and to give it to a virtuous man in distress, would be an advantage. Sensible men are never staggered when they see the exception. They know the importance of the rule, and protect it most eagerly at the very moment when it is doing more harm than good. The plain rule of justice is, that no man should be punished till he is found guilty; but because Mr. Headlam occasionally sees a bad man acquitted under this rule, and sent out unpunished upon the world, he forgets all the general good and safety of the principle is debauched by the exception, and applauds and advocates a system of prison discipline which renders injustice certain, in order to prevent it from being occasional.

The meaning of all preliminary imprisonment is, that the accused person should be forthcoming at the time of trial. It was never intended as a punishment. Bail is a far better invention than imprisonment, in cases where the heavy punishment of the offence would not induce the accused person to run away from any bail. Now, let us see the enormous difference this new style of punishment makes between two men, whose only difference is, that one is poor and the other rich. A and B are accused of some bailable offence. A has no bail to offer, and no money to support himself in prison, and takes, therefore, his four or five months in the treadmill. B gives bail, appears at his trial, and both are sentenced to two months' imprisonment. In this case, the one suffers three times as much as the other for the same offence: but suppose A is acquitted and B found guilty,—the innocent man has then laboured in the tread-mill five months because he was poor, and the guilty man labours two months because he was rich. We are aware that there must be, even without the tread-mill, a great and an inevitable difference between men (*in pari delicto*), some of whom can give bail, and some not; but that difference becomes infinitely more bitter and objectionable, in proportion as detention before trial assumes the character of severe and degrading punishment.

If motion in the tread-mill was otherwise as fascinating as millers describe it to be, still the mere degradation of the punishment is enough to revolt every feeling of an untried person. It is a punishment consecrated to convicted felons—and it has every character that such punishment ought to have. An untried person feels at once, in getting into the mill, that he is put to the labour of the guilty; that a mode of employment has been selected for him, which renders him infamous before a single

fact or argument has been advanced to establish his guilt. If men are put into the tread-mill before trial, it is literally of no sort of consequence whether they are acquitted or not. Acquittal does not shelter them from punishment, for they have already been punished. It does not screen them from infamy, for they have already been treated as if they were infamous; and the association of the tread-mill and crimes is not to be got over. This machine flings all the power of Juries into the hands of the magistrates, and makes every simple commitment more terrible than a conviction; for, in a conviction, the magistrate considers whether the offence has been committed or not; and does not send the prisoner to jail unless he think him guilty; but in a simple commitment, a man is not sent to jail because the magistrate is convinced of his guilt, but because he thinks a fair question may be made to a Jury whether the accused person is guilty or not. Still, however, the convicted and the suspected both go to the same mill; and he who is there upon the doubt, grinds as much flour as the other whose guilt is established by a full examination of conflicting evidence.

Where is the necessity for such a violation of common sense and common justice? Nobody asks for the idle prisoner before trial more than a very plain and moderate diet. Offer him, if you please, some labour which is less irksome, and less infamous than the tread-mill,—bribe him by improved diet, and a share of the earnings; there will not be three men out of an hundred who would refuse such an invitation, and spurn at such an improvement of their condition. A little humane attention and persuasion, among men who ought, upon every principle of justice, to be considered as innocent, we should have thought much more consonant to English justice, and to the feelings of English magistrates, than the Rack and Wheel of Cubitt.*

* It is singular enough, that we use these observations in reviewing the pamphlet and system of a gentleman remarkable for the urbanity of his manners, and the mildness and humanity of his disposition.

Prison discipline is an object of considerable importance; but the common rights of mankind, and the common principles of justice, and humanity, and liberty, are of greater consequence even than prison discipline. Right and wrong, innocence and guilt, must not be confounded, that a prison-fancying Justice may bring his friend into the prison and say, "Look what a spectacle of order, silence, and decorum we have established here! no idleness, all grinding!—we produce a penny roll every second,—our prison is supposed to be the best regulated prison in England,—Cubitt is making us a new wheel of forty-felon power,—look how white the flour is, all done by untried prisoners—as innocent as lambs!" If prison discipline be to supersede every other consideration, why are penniless prisoners alone to be put into the mill before trial? If idleness in jails is so pernicious, why not put all prisoners in the tread-mill, the rich as well as those who are unable to support themselves? Why are the debtors left out? If fixed principles are to be given up, and prisons turned into a plaything for magistrates, nothing can be more unpicturesque than to see one half of the prisoners looking on, talking, gaping, and idling, while their poorer brethren are grinding for dinners and suppers.

It is a very weak argument to talk of the prisoners earning their support, and the expense to a county of maintaining prisoners before trial,—as if any rational man could ever expect to gain a farthing by an expensive mill, where felons are the moving power, and justices the superintendents, or as if such a trade must not necessarily be carried on at a great loss. If it were just and proper that prisoners, before trial, should be condemned to the mill, it would be of no consequence whether the county gained or lost by the trade. But the injustice of the practice can never be defended by its economy; and the fact is that it increases expenditure, while it violates principle. We are aware, that by leaving out repairs, alterations, and first costs, and a number of little particulars, a very neat account, signed by

a jailer, may be made up, which shall make the mill a miraculous combination of mercantile speculation and moral improvement; but we are too old for all this. We accuse nobody of intentional misrepresentation. This is quite out of the question with persons so highly respectable; but men are constantly misled by the spirit of system, and egregiously deceive themselves—even very good and sensible men.

Mr. Headlam compares the case of a prisoner before trial, claiming support, to that of a pauper claiming relief from his parish. But it seems to us that no two cases can be more dissimilar. The prisoner was no pauper before you took him up, and deprived him of his customers, tools, and market. It is by your act and deed that he is fallen into a state of pauperism; and nothing can be more preposterous, than first to make a man a pauper, and then to punish him for being so. It is true, that the apprehension and detention of the prisoner were necessary for the purposes of criminal justice; but the consequences arising from this necessary act cannot yet be imputed to the prisoner. He has brought it upon himself, it will be urged; but that remains to be seen, and will not be known till he is tried; and till it is known you have no right to take it for granted, and to punish him as if it were proved.

There seems to be in the minds of some gentlemen a notion, that when once a person is in prison, it is of little consequence how he is treated afterwards. The tyranny which prevailed, of putting a person in a particular dress before trial, now abolished by act of Parliament, was justified by this train of reasoning:—The man has been rendered infamous by imprisonment. He cannot be rendered more so, dress him as you will. His character is not rendered worse by the tread-mill, than it is by being sent to the place where the tread-mill is at work. The substance of this way of thinking is, that when a fellow-creature is in the frying-pan, there is no harm in pushing him into the fire; that a little more misery—a little more infamy—a few more links, are of no sort of consequence in a prison-life. If this monstrous style of reasoning extended to hospitals as well as prisons, there would be no harm in breaking the small bone of a man's leg, because the large one was fractured, or in peppering with small shot a person who was wounded with a cannon-ball. The principle is, because a man is very wretched, there is no harm in making him a little more so. The steady answer to all this is, that a man is imprisoned before trial, *solely* for the purpose of securing his appearance at his trial; and that no punishment nor privation, not clearly and candidly necessary for that purpose, should be inflicted upon him. I keep you in prison, because criminal justice would be defeated by your flight, if I did not; but criminal justice can go on very well without degrading you to hard and infamous labour, or denying you any reasonable gratification. For these reasons, the first of those acts is just, the rest are mere tyranny.

Mr. Nicoll, in his opinion, tells us, that he has no doubt Parliament would amend the bill, if the omission were stated to them. We, on the contrary, have no manner of doubt that Parliament would treat such a petition with the contempt it deserved. Mr. Peel is much too enlightened and sensible to give any countenance to such a great and glaring error. In this case,—and we wish it were a more frequent one—the wisdom comes from within, and the error from without the walls of Parliament.

A prisoner before trial who can support himself, ought to be allowed every fair and rational enjoyment which he can purchase, not incompatible with prison discipline. He should be allowed to buy ale or wine in moderation,—to use tobacco, or anything else he can pay for, within the above-mentioned limits. If he cannot support himself, and declines work, then he should be supported upon a very plain, but still a plentiful diet (something better, we think, than bread and water); and all prisoners before trial should be *allowed* to work. By a liberal share of earnings (or rather by rewards, for there would be no earnings), and also by an im-

proved diet, and in the hands of humane magistrates*, there would soon appear to be no necessity for appealing to the tread-mill till trial was over.

This tread-mill, after trial, is certainly a very excellent method of punishment, as far as we are yet acquainted with its effects. We think, at present, however, it is a little abused; and hereafter it is our intention to express our opinion upon the limits to which it ought to be confined. Upon this point, however, we do not much differ from Mr. Headlam; although in his remarks on the treatment of prisoners before trial, we think he has made a very serious mistake, and has attempted (without knowing what he was doing, and meaning, we are persuaded, nothing but what was honest and just), to pluck up one of the ancient landmarks of human justice.†

* All magistrates should remember, that nothing is more easy to a person entrusted with power than to convince himself it is his duty to treat his fellow-creatures with severity and rigour,—and then to persuade himself that he is doing it very reluctantly, and contrary to his real feeling.

† We hope this article will conciliate our old friend Mr. Roscoe; who is very angry with us for some of our former lucubrations on prison discipline,—and, above all, because we are not grave enough for him. The difference is thus stated:—Six ducks are stolen. Mr. Roscoe would commit the man to prison for six weeks, perhaps,—reason with him, argue with him, give him tracts, send clergymen to him, work him gently at some useful trade, and try to turn him from the habit of stealing poultry. *We* would keep him hard at work twelve hours every day at the tread-mill, feed him only so as not to impair his health, and then give him as much of Mr. Roscoe's system as was compatible with our own; and we think our method would diminish the number of duck-stealers more effectually than that of the historian of Leo X. The primary duck-stealer would, we think, be as effectually deterred from repeating the offence by the terror of our imprisonment, as by the excellence of Mr. Roscoe's education—and, what is of infinitely greater consequence, innumerable duck-stealers would be prevented. Because punishment does not annihilate crime, it is folly to say it does not lessen it. It did not stop the murder of Mrs. Donatty; but how many Mrs. Donattys has it kept alive! When we recommend severity, we recommend, of course, that degree of severity which will not excite compassion for the sufferer, and lessen the horror of the crime. This is why we do not recommend torture and amputation of limbs. When a man has been proved to have committed a crime, it is expedient that society should make use of that man for the diminution of crime: he belongs to them for that purpose. Our primary duty, in such a case, is so to treat the culprit that many other persons may be rendered better, or prevented from being worse, by dread of the same treatment; and, making this the principal object, to combine with it as much as possible the improvement of the individual. The ruffian who killed Mr. Mumford was hung within forty-eight hours. Upon Mr. Roscoe's principles, this was wrong; for it certainly was not the way to reclaim the man:—We say on the contrary, the object was to do anything with the man which would render murders less frequent, and that the conversion of the man was a mere trifle compared to this. His death probably prevented the necessity of reclaiming a dozen murderers. That death will not, indeed, prevent all murders in that county; but many who have seen it, and many who have heard of it, will swallow their revenge from the dread of being hanged. Mr. Roscoe is very severe upon our style; but poor dear Mr. Roscoe should remember that men have different tastes and different methods of going to work. We feel these matters as deeply as he does. But why so cross upon this or any other subject?

AMERICA. (E. Review, 1824.)

1. *Travels through Part of the United States and Canada, in* 1818 *and* 1819. By John M. Duncan, A.B. Glasgow. 1823.
2. *Letters from North America, written during a Tour in the United States and Canada.* By Adam Hodgson. London. 1824.
3. *An Excursion through the United States and Canada, during the Years* 1822–3. By an English Gentleman. London. 1824.

There is a set of miserable persons in England, who are dreadfully afraid of America and everything American—whose great delight is to see that country ridiculed and vilified—and who appear to imagine that all the abuses which exist in this country acquire additional vigour and chance of duration from every book of travels which pours forth its venom and falsehood on the United States. We shall from time to time call the attention of the public to this subject, not from any party spirit, but because we love truth, and praise excellence wherever we find it; and because we think the example of America will in many instances tend

to open the eyes of Englishmen to their true interests.

The *Economy* of America is a great and important object for our imitation. The salary of Mr. Bagot, our late Ambassador, was, we believe, rather higher than that of the President of the United States. The Vice-President receives rather less than the second Clerk of the House of Commons; and all salaries, civil and military, are upon the same scale; and yet no country is better served than America! Mr. Hume has at last persuaded the English people to look a little into their accounts, and to see how sadly they are plundered. But we ought to suspend our contempt for America, and consider whether we have not a very momentous lesson to learn from this wise and cautious people on the subject of economy.

A lesson on the importance of Religious Toleration, we are determined, it would seem, *not* to learn,—either from America, or from any other quarter of the globe. The high sheriff of New York, last year, was a Jew. It was with the utmost difficulty that a bill was carried this year to allow the first duke of England to carry a gold stick before the King—because he was a Catholic!—and yet we think ourselves entitled to indulge in impertinent sneers at America,—as if civilisation did not depend more upon making wise laws for the promotion of human happiness, than in having good inns, and post-horses, and civil waiters. The circumstances of the Dissenters' Marriage Bill are such as would excite the contempt of a Chictaw or Cherokee, if he could be brought to understand them. A certain class of Dissenters beg they may not be compelled to say that they marry in the name of the Trinity, because they do not believe in the Trinity. Never mind, say the corruptionists, you must go on saying you marry in the name of the Trinity whether you believe in it or not. We know that such a protestation from you will be false: but, unless you make it, your wives shall be concubines, and your children illegitimate. Is it possible to conceive a greater or more useless tyranny than this?

"In the religious freedom which America enjoys, I see a more unquestioned superiority. In Britain we enjoy toleration, but here they enjoy liberty. If Government has a right to grant toleration to any particular set of religious opinions, it has also a right to take it away; and such a right with regard to opinions exclusively religious I would deny in all cases, because totally inconsistent with the nature of religion, in the proper meaning of the word, and equally irreconcilable with civil liberty, rightly so called. God has given to each of us his inspired word, and a rational mind to which that word is addressed. He has also made known to us, that each for himself must answer at his tribunal for his principles and conduct. What man, then, or body of men, has a right to tell me, 'You do not think aright on religious subjects, but we will tolerate your error?' The answer is a most obvious one, 'Who gave you authority to dictate?—or what exclusive claim have you to infallibility?' If my sentiments do not lead me into conduct inconsistent with the welfare of my fellow-creatures, the question as to their accuracy or fallacy is one between God and my own conscience; and, though a fair subject for argument, is none for compulsion.

"The Inquisition undertook to regulate astronomical science, and kings and parliaments have with equal propriety presumed to legislate upon questions of theology. The world has outgrown the former, and it will one day be ashamed that it has been so long of outgrowing the latter. The founders of the American republic saw the absurdity of employing the attorney-general to refute deism and infidelity, or of attempting to influence opinion on abstract subjects by penal enactment; they saw also the injustice of taxing the whole to support the religious opinions of the few, and have set an example which older governments will one day or other be compelled to follow.

"In America the question is not, 'What is his creed?—but, What is his conduct? Jews have all the privileges of Christians; Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and Independents, meet on common ground. No religious test is required to qualify for public office, except in some cases a mere verbal assent to the truth of the Christian religion; and, in every court throughout the country, it is optional whether you give your affirmation or your oath."—(*Duncan's Travels*, Vol. II. pp. 328—330.)

In fact, it is hardly possible for any nation to show a greater superiority over another than the Americans, in this

particular, have done over this country. They have fairly and completely, and probably for ever, extinguished that spirit of religious persecution which has been the employment and the curse of mankind for four or five centuries, —not only that persecution which imprisons and scourges for religious opinions, but the tyranny of incapacitation, which, by disqualifying from civil offices, and cutting a man off from the lawful objects of ambition, endeavours to strangle religious freedom in silence, and to enjoy all the advantages, without the blood, and noise, and fire of persecution. What passes in the mind of one mean blockhead is the general history of all persecution. "This man pretends to know better than me—I cannot subdue him by argument; but I will take care he shall never be mayor or alderman of the town in which he lives; I will never consent to the repeal of the Test Act or to Catholic Emancipation; I will teach the fellow to differ from me in religious opinions!" So says the Episcopalian to the Catholic—and so the Catholic says to the Protestant. But the wisdom of America keeps them all down—secures to them all their just rights—gives to each of them their separate pews, and bells, and steeples —makes them all aldermen in their turns—and quietly extinguishes the faggots which each is preparing for the combustion of the other. Nor is this indifference to religious subjects in the American people, but pure civilisation —a thorough comprehension of what is best calculated to secure the public happiness and peace—and a determination that this happiness and peace shall not be violated by the insolence of any human being, in the garb, and under the sanction, of religion. In this particular, the Americans are at the head of all the nations of the world: and at the same time they are, especially in the Eastern and Midland States, so far from being indifferent on subjects of religion, that they may be most justly characterised as a very religious people. but they are devout without being unjust (the great problem in religion); a higher proof of civilisation than painted tea-cups, water-proof leather, or broad cloth at two guineas a yard.

America is exempted, by its very newness as a nation, from many of the evils of the old governments of Europe. It has no mischievous remains of feudal institutions, and no violations of political economy sanctioned by time, and older than the age of reason. If a man find a partridge upon his ground eating his corn, in any part of Kentucky or Indiana, he may kill it, even if his father be not a Doctor of Divinity. The Americans do not exclude their own citizens from any branch of commerce which they leave open to all the rest of the world.

"One of them said, that he was well acquainted with a British subject, residing at Newark, Upper Canada, who annually smuggled from 500 to 1000 chests of tea into that province from the United States. He mentioned the name of this man, who he said was growing very rich in consequence; and he stated the manner in which the fraud was managed. Now, as all the tea ought to be brought from England, it is of course very expensive; and therefore the Canadian tea dealers, after buying one or two chests at Montreal or elsewhere, which have the Custom-house mark upon them, fill them up ever afterwards with tea brought from the United States. It is calculated that near 10,000 chests are annually consumed in the Canadas, of which not more than 2000 or 3000 come from Europe. Indeed, when I had myself entered Canada, I was told that of every fifteen pounds of tea sold there thirteen were smuggled. The profit upon smuggling this article is from 50 to 100 per cent., and, with an extensive and wild frontier like Canada, cannot be prevented. Indeed it every year increases, and is brought to a more perfect system. But I suppose that the English Government, which is the perfection of wisdom, will never allow the Canadian merchants to trade direct to China, in order that (from pure charity) the whole profit of the tea trade may be given up to the United States."—(*Excursion*, pp. 394, 395.)

"You will readily conceive, that it is with no small mortification that I hear these American merchants talk of sending their ships to London and Liverpool, to take in goods or specie, with which to purchase tea for the supply of European ports almost within sight of our own shores. They often taunt me, by asking me what our govern-

ment can possibly mean by prohibiting us from engaging in a profitable trade, which is open to them and to all the world? or where can be our boasted liberties, while we tamely submit to the infraction of our natural rights, to supply a monopoly as absurd as it is unjust, and to honour the caprice of a company who exclude their fellow-subjects from a branch of commerce which they do not pursue themselves, but leave to the enterprise of foreigners, or commercial rivals? On such occasions I can only reply, that both our government and people are growing wiser; and that if the charter of the East India Company be renewed, when it next expires, I will allow them to infer, that the people of England have little influence in the administration of their own affairs."—(*Hodgson's Letters*, Vol. II. pp. 128, 129.)

Though America is a confederation of republics, they are in many cases much more amalgamated than the various parts of Great Britain. If a citizen of the United States can make a shoe, he is at liberty to make a shoe anywhere between Lake Ontario and New Orleans,—he may sole on the Mississippi,—heel on the Missouri,—measure Mr. Birkbeck on the little Wabash, or take (which our best politicians do not find an easy matter) the length of Mr. Munro's foot on the banks of the Potowmac. But woe to the cobbler, who, having made Hessian boots for the aldermen of Newcastle, should venture to invest with these coriaceous integuments the leg of a liege subject at York. A yellow ant in a nest of red ants—a butcher's dog in a fox kennel—a mouse in a bee-hive,—all feel the effects of untimely intrusion; —but far preferable their fate to that of the misguided artisan, who, misled by sixpenny histories of England, and conceiving his country to have been united at the Heptarchy, goes forth from his native town to stitch freely within the sea-girt limits of Albion. Him the mayor, him the alderman, him the recorder, him the quarter sessions would worry. Him the justices before trial would long to get into the tread-mill*; and would much lament that, by a recent act, they could not do so, even with the intruding tradesman's consent; but the moment he was tried, they would push him in with redoubled energy, and leave him to tread himself into a conviction of the barbarous institutions of his corporation-divided country.

Too much praise cannot be given to the Americans for their great attention to the subject of Education. All the public lands are surveyed according to the direction of Congress. They are divided into townships of six miles square, by lines running with the cardinal points, and consequently crossing each other at right angles. Every township is divided into 36 sections, each a mile square, and containing 640 acres. One section in each township is reserved, and given in perpetuity for the benefit of common schools. In addition to this the states of Tennessee and Ohio have received grants for the support of colleges and academies. The appropriation generally in the new States for seminaries of the higher orders, amount to one fifth of those for

* This puts us in mind of our friend Mr. Headlam, who, we hear, has written an answer to our Observations on the Tread-mill before Trial. It would have been a very easy thing for us to have hung Mr. Headlam up as a spectacle to the United Kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland, the principality of Wales, and the town of Berwick-on-Tweed; but we have no wish to make a worthy and respectable man appear ridiculous. For these reasons we have not even looked at his pamphlet, and we decline entering into a controversy upon a point, where among men of sense and humanity (who had not heated themselves in the dispute), there cannot possibly be any difference of opinion. All members of both Houses of Parliament were unanimous in their condemnation of the odious and nonsensical practice of working prisoners in the tread-mill before trial. It had not one single advocate. Mr. Headlam and the magistrates of the North Riding, in their eagerness to save a relic of their prison system, forgot themselves so far as to petition to be intrusted with the power of putting prisoners to work before trial, *with their own consent*—the answer of the Legislature was, "We will not trust you,"—the severest practical rebuke ever received by any public body. We will leave it to others to determine whether it was deserved. We have no doubt the great body of magistrates meant well. They *must* have meant well—but they have been sadly misled, and have thrown odium on the subordinate administration of justice, which it is far from deserving on other occasions, in their hands. This strange piece of nonsense is, however, now well ended.—*Requiescat in pace!*

common schools. It appears from Seybert's Statistical Annals, that the land, in the states and territories on the east side of the Mississippi, in which appropriations have been made, amounts to 237,300 acres; and according to the ratio above mentioned, the aggregate on the east side of the Mississippi is 7,900,000. The same system of appropriation applied to the west, will make, for schools and colleges, 6,600,000; and the total appropriation for literary purposes, in the new states and territories, 14,500,000 acres, which, at two dollars per acre, would be 29,000,000 dollars. These facts are very properly quoted by Mr. Hodgson; and it is impossible to speak too highly of their value and importance. They quite put into the back-ground everything which has been done in the Old World for the improvement of the lower orders, and confer deservedly upon the Americans the character of a wise, a reflecting, and a virtuous people.

It is rather surprising that such a people, spreading rapidly over so vast a portion of the earth, and cultivating all the liberal and useful arts so successfully, should be so extremely sensitive and touchy as the Americans are said to be. We really thought at one time they would have fitted out an armament against the Edinburgh and Quarterly Reviews, and burnt down Mr. Murray's and Mr. Constable's shops, as we did the American Capitol. We, however, remember no other anti-American crime of which we were guilty, than a preference of Shakspeare and Milton over Joel Barlow and Timothy Dwight. That opinion we must still take the liberty of retaining. There is nothing in Dwight comparable to the finest passages of Paradise Lost, nor is Mr. Barlow ever humorous or pathetic, as the great Bard of the English stage is humorous and pathetic. We have always been strenuous* advocates for, and admirers of, America—not taking our ideas from the overweening vanity of the weaker part of the Americans themselves, but from what we have observed of their real energy and wisdom. It is very natural that we Scotch, who live in a little shabby scraggy corner of a remote island, with a climate which cannot ripen an apple, should be jealous of the aggressive pleasantry of more favoured people; but that Americans, who have done so much for themselves, and received so much from nature, should be flung into such convulsions by English Reviews and Magazines, is really a sad specimen of Columbian juvenility. We hardly dare to quote the following account of an American rout, for fear of having our motives misrepresented,—and strongly suspect that there are but few Americans who could be brought to admit that a Philadelphia or Boston concern of this nature is not quite equal to the most brilliant assemblies of London or Paris.

"A tea party is a serious thing in this country; and some of those at which I have been present in New York and elsewhere, have been on a very large scale. In the modern houses the two principal apartments are on the first floor, and communicate by large folding-doors, which on gala days throw wide their ample portals, converting the two apartments into one. At the largest party which I have seen, there were about thirty young ladies present, and more than as many gentlemen. Every sofa, chair, and footstool were occupied by the ladies, and little enough room some of them appeared to have after all. The gentlemen were obliged to be content with walking up and down, talking now with one lady, now with another. Tea was brought in by a couple of blacks, carrying large trays, one covered with cups, the other with cake. Slowly making the round, and retiring at intervals for additional supplies, the ladies were gradually gone over;

* Ancient women, whether in or out of breeches, will of course imagine that we are the enemies of the institutions of our country, because we are the admirers of the institutions of America: but circumstances differ. American institutions are too new, English institutions are ready made to our hands. If we were to build the house afresh, we might perhaps avail ourselves of the improvements of a new plan; but we have no sort of wish to pull down an excellent house, strong, warm, and comfortable, because, upon second trial, we might be able to alter and amend it,—a principle which would perpetuate demolition and construction. Our plan, where circumstances are tolerable, is to sit down and enjoy ourselves.

and after much patience the gentlemen began to enjoy the beverage 'which cheers but not inebriates;' still walking about, or leaning against the wall, with the cup and saucer in their hand.

"As soon as the first course was over, the hospitable trays again entered, bearing a chaos of preserves—peaches, pine-apples, ginger, oranges, citrons, pears, &c. in tempting display. A few of the young gentlemen now accompanied the revolution of the trays, and sedulously attended to the pleasure of the ladies. The party was so numerous that the period between the commencement and the termination of the round was sufficient to justify a new solicitation; and so the ceremony continued, with very little intermission, during the whole evening. Wine succeeded the preserves, and dried fruit followed the wine; which, in its turn, was supported by sandwiches in the name of supper, and a forlorn hope of confectionary and frost work. I pitied the poor blacks who, like Tantalus, had such a profusion of dainties the whole evening at their finger ends, without the possibility of partaking of them. A little music and dancing gave variety to the scene; which to some of us was a source of considerable satisfaction; for when a number of ladies were on the floor, those who cared not for the dance had the pleasure of getting a seat. About eleven o'clock I did myself the honour of escorting a lady home, and was well pleased to have an excuse for escaping."—(*Duncan's Travels*, Vol. II. pp. 279, 280.)

The coaches must be given up; so must the roads, and so must the inns. They are of course what these accommodations are in all new countries; and much like what English great-grandfathers talk about as existing in this country at the first period of their recollection. The great inconvenience of American inns, however, in the eyes of an Englishman, is one which more sociable travellers must feel less acutely—we mean the impossibility of being alone, of having a room separate from the rest of the company. There is nothing which an Englishman enjoys more than the pleasure of sulkiness,—of not being forced to hear a word from anybody which may occasion to him the necessity of replying. It is not so much that Mr. Bull disdains to talk, as that Mr. Bull has nothing to say. His forefathers have been out of spirits for six or seven hundred years, and seeing nothing but fog and vapour, he is out of spirits too; and when there is no selling or buying, or no business to settle, he prefers being alone and looking at the fire. If any gentleman were in distress, he would willingly lend a helping hand; but he thinks it no part of neighbourhood to talk to a person because he happens to be near him. In short, with many excellent qualities, it must be acknowledged that the English are the most disagreeable of all the nations of Europe,—more surly and morose, with less disposition to please, to exert themselves for the good of society, to make small sacrifices, and to put themselves out of their way. They are content with Magna Charter and Trial by Jury; and think they are not bound to excel the rest of the world in small behaviour, if they are superior to them in great institutions.

We are terribly afraid that some Americans spit upon the floor, even when that floor is covered by good carpets. Now all claims to civilisation are suspended till this secretion is otherwise disposed of. No English gentleman has spit upon the floor since the Heptarchy.

The curiosity for which the Americans are so much laughed at, is not only venial, but laudable. Where men live in woods and forests, as is the case, of course, in remote American settlements, it is the duty of every man to gratify the inhabitants by telling them his name, place, age, office, virtues, crimes, children, fortune, and remarks: and with fellow-travellers it seems to be almost a matter of necessity to do so. When men ride together for 300 or 400 miles through woods and prairies, it is of the greatest importance that they should be able to guess at subjects most agreeable to each other, and to multiply their common topics. Without knowing who your companion is, it is difficult to know both what to say and what to avoid. You may talk of honour and virtue to an attorney, or contend with a Virginian planter that men of a fair colour have no right to buy and sell men of a dusky colour. The following is a lively description of

the rights of interrogation, as understood and practised in America.

"As for the *Inquisitiveness* of the Americans, I do not think it has been at all exaggerated.—They certainly are, as they profess to be, a very inquiring people; and if we may sometimes be disposed to dispute the claims of their *love of knowing* to the character of a liberal curiosity, we must at least admit that they make a most liberal use of every means in their power to gratify it. I have seldom, however, had any difficulty in repressing their home questions, if I wished it, and without offending them; but I more frequently amused myself by putting them on the rack, civilly, and apparently unconsciously, eluded their inquiries for a time, and then awakening their gratitude by such a discovery of myself as I might choose to make. Sometimes a man would place himself at my side in the wilderness, and ride for a mile or two without the smallest communication between us, except a slight nod of the head. He would then, perhaps, make some grave remark on the weather, and if I assented, in a monosyllable, he would stick to my side for another mile or two, when he would commence his attack. 'I reckon, stranger, you do not belong to these parts?'—'No, sir; I am not a native of Alabama.'—'I guess you are from the north?'—'No, Sir; I am not from the north.'—'I guess you found the roads mighty muddy, and the creeks swimming. You are come a long way, I guess?'—'No, not so very far; we have travelled a few hundred miles since we turned our faces westward.'—'I guess you have seen Mr. ———, or General ———?' (mentioning the names of some well-known individuals in the Middle and Southern States, who were to serve as guide-posts to detect our route); but 'I have not the pleasure of knowing any of them,' or, 'I have the pleasure of knowing all,' equally defeated his purpose, but not his hopes. 'I reckon, stranger, you have had a good crop of cotton this year?'—'I am told, sir, the crops have been unusually abundant in Carolina and Georgia.'—'You grow tobacco, then, I guess?' (to track me to Virginia).—'No; I do not grow tobacco.' Here a modest inquirer would give up in despair, and trust to the chapter of accidents to develope my name and history; but I generally rewarded his modesty, and excited his gratitude, by telling him I would torment him no longer.

"The courage of a thorough-bred Yankee* would rise with his difficulties; and after a decent interval, he would resume: 'I hope no offence, sir; but you know we Yankees lose nothing for want of asking. I guess, stranger, you are from the old country?'—'Well, my friend, you have guessed right at last, and I am sure you deserve something for your perseverance: and now I suppose it will save us both trouble if I proceed to the second part of the story, and tell you where I am going. I am going to New Orleans.' This is really no exaggerated picture: dialogues, not indeed in these very words, but *to this effect*, occurred continually, and some of them more minute and extended than I can venture upon in a letter. I ought, however, to say, that many questions lose much of their familiarity when travelling in the wilderness. 'Where are you from?' and, 'Whither are you bound?' do not appear impertinent interrogations at sea; and often in the western wilds I found myself making inquiries which I should have thought very free and easy at home."—(*Hodgson's Letters*, Vol. II. pp. 32—35.)

In all new and distant settlements the forms of law must, of course, be very limited. No justice's warrant is current in the Dismal Swamp; constables are exceedingly puzzled in the neighbourhood of the Mississippi; and there is no tread-mill, either before or after trial, on the Little Wabash. The consequence of this is, that the settlers take the law into their own hands, and give notice to a justice-proof delinquent to quit the territory. If this notice is disobeyed, they assemble and whip the culprit, and this failing, on the second visit, they cut off his ears. In short, Captain Rock has his descendants in America. Mankind cannot live together without some approximation to justice; and if the actual government will not govern well, or cannot govern well, is too wicked or too weak to do so—then men prefer Rock to anarchy. The following is the best account we have seen of this system of irregular justice.

"After leaving Carlyle, I took the Shawnee town road that branches off to the S. E., and passed the Walnutt Hills, and Moore's Prairie. These two places had a year or two before been infested by a notorious gang of robbers and forgers, who had fixed themselves in these wild parts in order to avoid justice. As the country

* In America, the term Yankee is applied to the natives of New England only, and is generally used with an air of pleasantry.

became more settled, these desperadoes became more and more troublesome. The inhabitants therefore took that method of getting rid of them that had been adopted not many years ago in Hopkinson and Henderson counties, Kentucky, and which is absolutely necessary in new and thinly settled districts, where it is almost impossible to punish a criminal according to legal forms.

"On such occasions, therefore, all the quiet and industrious men of a district form themselves into companies, under the name of 'Regulators.' They appoint officers, put themselves under their orders, and bind themselves to assist and stand by each other. The first step they then take is to send notice to any notorious vagabonds, desiring them to quit the State in a certain number of days, under the penalty of receiving a domiciliary visit. Should the person who receives the notice refuse to comply, they suddenly assemble, and when unexpected, go in the night time to the rogue's house, take him out, tie him to a tree, and give him a severe whipping, every one of the party striking him a certain number of times.

"This discipline is generally sufficient to drive off the culprit; but should he continue obstinate, and refuse to avail himself of another warning, the Regulators pay him a second visit, inflict a still severer whipping, with the addition probably of cutting off both his ears. No culprit has ever been known to remain after a second visit. For instance, an old man, the father of a family, all of whom he educated as robbers, fixed himself at Moore's Prairie, and committed numerous thefts, &c. &c. He was hardy enough to remain after the first visit, when both he and his sons received a whipping. At the second visit the Regulators punished him very severely, and cut off his ears. This drove him off, together with his whole gang; and travellers can now pass in perfect safety where it was once dangerous to travel alone.

"There is also a company of Regulators near Vincennes, who have broken up a notorious gang of coiners and thieves who had fixed themselves near that place. These rascals, before they were driven off, had parties settled at different distances in the woods, and thus held communication and passed horses and stolen goods from one to another, from the Ohio to Lake Eric, and from thence into Canada or the New England States. Thus it was next to impossible to detect the robbers, or to recover the stolen property.

"This practice of *Regulating* seems very strange to an European. I have talked with some of the chief men of the Regulators, who all lamented the necessity of such a system. They very sensibly remarked, that when the country became more thickly settled, there would no longer be any necessity for such proceedings, and that they should all be delighted at being able to obtain justice in a more formal manner. I forgot to mention that the rascals punished have sometimes prosecuted the Regulators for an assault. The juries, however, knowing the bad character of the prosecutors, would give but trifling damages, which, divided among so many, amounted to next to nothing for each individual."—(*Excursion*, pp. 233—236.)

This same traveller mentions his having met at table three or four American ex-kings—presidents who had served their time, and had retired into private life; he observes also upon the effect of a democratical government in preventing mobs. Mobs are created by opposition to the wishes of the people;—but when the wishes of the people are consulted so completely as they are consulted in America—all motives for the agency of mobs are done away.

"It is, indeed, entirely a government of opinion. Whatever the people wish is done. If they want any alteration of laws, tariffs, &c., they inform their representatives, and if there be a majority that wish it, the alteration is made at once. In most European countries there is a portion of the population denominated the *mob*, who, not being acquainted with real liberty, give themselves up to occasional fits of licentiousness. But in the United States there is no *mob*, for every man feels himself free. At the time of Burr's conspiracy, Mr. Jefferson said, that there was little to be apprehended from it, as every man felt himself a part of the general sovereignty. The event proved the truth of this assertion: and Burr, who in any other country would have been hanged, drawn, and quartered, is at present leading an obscure life in the city of New York, despised by every one."—(*Excursion*, p. 70.)

It is a real blessing for America to be exempted from that vast burthen of taxes, the consequences of a long series of foolish just and necessary wars, carried on to please kings and queens, or the waiting-maids and waiting-lords or gentlemen who have always governed kings and queens in the Old

World. The Americans owe this good to the newness of their government; and though there are few classical associations or historical recollections in the United States, this barrenness is well purchased by the absence of all the feudal nonsense, inveterate abuses, and profligate debts of an old country.

"The good effects of a free government are visible throughout the whole country. There are no tithes, no poor-rates, no excise, no heavy internal taxes, no commercial monopolies. An American can make candles if he have tallow, can distil brandy if he have grapes or peaches, and can make beer if he have malt and hops, without asking leave of any one, and much less with any fear of incurring punishment. How would a farmer's wife there be astonished, if told that it was contrary to law for her to make soap out of the potass obtained on the farm, and of the grease she herself had saved! When an American has made these articles, he may build his little vessel, and take them without hinderance to any part of the world; for there is no rich company of merchants that can say to him, 'You shall not trade to India; and you shall not buy a pound of tea of the Chinese; as, by so doing, you would infringe upon our privileges.' In consequence of this freedom, all the seas are covered with their vessels, and the people at home are active and independent. I never saw a beggar in any part of the United States; nor was I ever asked for charity but once—and that was by an Irishman."—(*Excursion*, pp. 70, 71.)

America is so differently situated from the old governments of Europe, that the United States afford no political precedents that are exactly applicable to our old governments. There is no idle and discontented population. When they have peopled themselves up to the Mississippi, they cross to the Missouri, and will go on till they are stopped by the Western Ocean; and then, when there are a number of persons who have nothing to do, and nothing to gain, no hope for lawful industry and great interest in promoting changes, we may consider their situation as somewhat similar to our own, and their example as touching us more nearly. The changes in the constitution of the particular States seem to be very frequent, very radical, and to us very alarming;—they seem, however, to be thought very little of in that country, and to be very little heard of in Europe. Mr. Duncan, in the following passage, speaks of them with European feelings.

"The other great obstacle to the prosperity of the American nation, universal suffrage*, will not exhibit the full extent of its evil tendency for a long time to come; and it is possible that ere that time some antidote may be discovered, to prevent or alleviate the mischief which we might naturally expect from it. It does, however, seem ominous of evil, that so little ceremony is at present used with the constitutions of the various States. The people of Connecticut, not contented with having prospered abundantly under their old system, have lately assembled a convention, composed of delegates from all parts of the country, in which the former order of things has been condemned entirely, and a completely new constitution manufactured; which, among other things, provides for the same process being again gone through as soon as the *profanum vulgus* takes it into its head to desire it.† A sorry legacy the British Constitution would be to us, if it were at the mercy of a meeting of delegates, to be summoned whenever a majority of the people took a fancy for a new one; and I am afraid that if the Americans continue to cherish a fondness for such repairs, the Highlandman's pistol with its new stock, lock, and barrel, will bear a close resemblance to what is ultimately produced."—(*Duncan's Travels*, Vol. II. pp. 335, 336.)

In the Excursion there is a list of the American navy, which, in conjunction with the navy of France, will one day or another, we fear, settle the Catholic question in a way not quite agreeable to the Earl of Liverpool for the time being, nor very creditable to the wisdom of those ancestors of whom we hear, and from whom we suffer so much. The regulations of the American navy seem to be admirable. The States are making great exertions to increase this navy; and since the capture of so many English ships, it has

* In the greater number of the States, every white person, 21 years of age, who has paid taxes for one year, is a voter; in others, some additional qualifications are required, but they are not such as materially to limit the privilege.

† The people of the State of New York have subsequently taken a similar fancy to *clout the cauldron*. (1822.)

become the favourite science of the people at large. Their flotillas on the lakes completely defeated ours during the last war.

Fanaticism of every description seems to rage and flourish in America, which has no Establishment, in about the same degree which it does here under the nose of an Established Church;—they have their prophets and prophetesses, their preaching encampments, female preachers, and every variety of noise, folly, and nonsense, like ourselves. Among the most singular of these fanaties, are the Harmonites. Rapp, their founder, was a dissenter from the Lutheran Church, and therefore, of course, the Lutheran clergy of Stutgard (near to which he lived) began to put Mr. Rapp in white sheets, to prove him guilty of theft, parricide, treason, and all the usual crimes of which men dissenting from established churches are so often guilty,—and delicate hints were given respecting faggots! Stutgard abounds with underwood and clergy; and—away went Mr. Rapp to the United States, and, with a great multitude of followers, settled about twenty-four miles from our countryman Mr. Birkbeck. His people have here built a large town, and planted a vineyard, where they make very agreeable wine. They carry on also a very extensive system of husbandry, and are the masters of many flocks and herds. They have a distillery, brewery, tannery, make hats, shoes, cotton and woollen cloth, and everything necessary to the comfort of life. Every one belongs to some particular trade. But in bad weather, when there is danger of losing their crops, Rapp blows a horn, and calls them all together. Over every trade there is a head man, who receives the money, and gives a receipt, signed by Rapp, to whom all the money collected is transmitted. When any of these workmen wants a hat or a coat, Rapp signs him an order for the garment, for which he goes to the store, and is fitted. They have one large store where these manufactures are deposited. This store is much resorted to by the neighbourhood, on account of the goodness and cheapness of the articles. They have built an excellent house for their founder, Rapp,—as it might have been predicted they would have done. The Harmonites profess equality, community of goods, and celibacy, for the men and women (let Mr. Malthus hear this) live separately, and are not allowed the slightest intercourse. In order to keep up their numbers, they have once or twice sent over for a supply of Germans, as they admit no Americans, of any intercourse with whom they are very jealous. The Harmonites dress and live plainly. It is a part of their creed that they should do so. Rapp, however, and the head men have no such particular creed for themselves; and indulge in wine, beer, grocery, and other irreligious diet. Rapp is both governor and priest,—preaches to them in church, and directs all their proceedings in their working hours. In short, Rapp seems to have made use of the religious propensities of mankind, to persuade one or two thousand fools to dedicate their lives to his service; and if they do not get tired, and fling their prophet into a horse-pond, they will in all probability disperse as soon as he dies.

Unitarians are increasing very fast in the United States, not being kept down by charges from bishops and archdeacons, their natural enemies.

The author of the Excursion remarks upon the total absence of all games in America. No cricket, foot-ball, nor leap-frog—all seems solid and profitable.

"One thing that I could not help remarking with regard to the Americans in general, is the total want of all those games and sports that obtained for our country the appellation of 'Merry England.' Although children usually transmit stories and sports from one generation to another, and although many of our nursery games and tales are supposed to have been imported into England in the vessels of Hengist and Horsa, yet our brethren in the United States seem entirely to have forgotten the childish amusements of our common ancestors. In America I never saw even the schoolboys playing at any game whatsoever. Cricket, foot-ball, quoits, &c. appear to be utterly unknown; and I believe that if an American were to see grown-up men playing at cricket, he would express as much as-

tonishment as the Italians did when some Englishmen played at this finest of all games in the Casina at Florence. Indeed, that joyous spirit which, in our country, animates not only childhood, but also maturer age, can rarely or never be seen among the inhabitants of the United States."—(*Excursion*, pp. 502, 503.)

These are a few of the leading and prominent circumstances respecting America, mentioned in the various works before us: of which works we can recommend the Letters of Mr. Hodgson, and the Excursion into Canada, as sensible, agreeable books, written in a very fair spirit.

America seems, on the whole, to be a country possessing vast advantages, and little inconveniences; they have a cheap government, and bad roads; they pay no tithes, and have stage coaches without springs. They have no poor-laws, and no monopolies—but their inns are inconvenient, and travellers are teased with questions. They have no collections in the fine arts; but they have no Lord Chancellor, and they can go to law without absolute ruin. They cannot make Latin verses, but they expend immense sums in the education of the poor. In all this the balance is prodigiously in their favour: but then comes the great disgrace and danger of America — the existence of slavery, which, if not timously corrected, will one day entail (and ought to entail) a bloody servile war upon the Americans—which will separate America into slave States and States disclaiming slavery, and which remains at present as the foulest blot in the moral character of that people. A high-spirited nation, who cannot endure the slightest act of foreign aggression, and who revolt at the very shadow of domestic tyranny, beat with cart-whips, and bind with chains, and murder for the merest trifles, wretched human beings, who are of a more dusky colour than themselves; and have recently admitted in their Union a new State, with the express permission of ingrafting this atrocious wickedness into their constitution! No one can admire the simple wisdom and manly firmness of the Americans more than we do, or more despise the pitiful propensity which exists among Government runners to vent their small spite at their character; but on the subject of slavery, the conduct of America is, and has been, most reprehensible. It is impossible to speak of it with too much indignation and contempt; but for it we should look forward with unqualified pleasure to such a land of freedom, and such a magnificent spectacle of human happiness.

MEMOIRS OF CAPTAIN ROCK.

(E. Review, 1824.)

Memoirs of Captain Rock, the celebrated Irish Chieftain; with some Account of his Ancestors. Written by Himself. Fourth Edition. 12mo. London. 1824.

This agreeable and witty book is generally supposed to have been written by Mr. Thomas Moore, a gentleman of small stature, but full of genius, and a steady friend of all that is honourable and just. He has here borrowed the name of a celebrated Irish leader, to typify that spirit of violence and insurrection which is necessarily generated by systematic oppression, and rudely avenges its crimes; and the picture he has drawn of its prevalence in that unhappy country is at once piteous and frightful. Its effect in exciting our horror and indignation is in the long run increased, we think,—though at first it may seem counteracted, by the tone of levity, and even jocularity, under which he has chosen to veil the deep sarcasm and substantial terrors of his story. We smile at first, and are amused—and wonder, as we proceed, that the humorous narrative should produce conviction and pity—shame, abhorrence, and despair!

England seems to have treated Ireland much in the same way as Mrs. Brownrigg treated her apprentice — for which Mrs. Brownrigg is hanged in the first volume of the Newgate Calendar. Upon the whole, we think the apprentice is better off than the Irishman: as Mrs. Brownrigg merely starves and beats her, without any

attempt to prohibit her from going to any shop, or praying at any church, her apprentice might select; and once or twice, if we remember rightly, Brownrigg appears to have felt some compassion. Not so Old England, who indulges rather in a steady baseness, uniform brutality, and unrelenting oppression.

Let us select from this entertaining little book a short history of dear Ireland, such as even some profligate idle member of the House of Commons, voting as his master bids him, may perchance throw his eye upon, and reflect for a moment upon the iniquity to which he lends his support.

For some centuries after the reign of Henry II. the Irish were killed like game, by persons qualified or unqualified. Whether dogs were used does not appear quite certain, though it is probable they were, spaniels as well as pointers; and that, after a regular point by Basto, well backed by Ponto and Cæsar, Mr. O'Donnel or Mr. O'Leary bolted from the thicket, and were bagged by the English sportsman. With Henry II. came in tithes, to which, in all probability, about one million of lives may have been sacrificed in Ireland. In the reign of Edward I. the Irish who were settled near the English requested that the benefit of the English laws might be extended to them; but the remonstrance of the barons with the hesitating king was in substance this:—"You have made us a present of these wild gentlemen, and we particularly request that no measures may be adopted to check us in that full range of tyranny and oppression in which we consider the value of such gift to consist. You might as well give us sheep, and prevent us from shearing the wool, or roasting the meat." This reasoning prevailed, and the Irish were kept to their barbarism, and the barons preserved their live stock.

"Read 'Orange faction' (says Captain Rock) here, and you have the wisdom of our rulers, at the end of near six centuries, *in statu quo*.—The grand periodic year of the stoics, at the close of which everything was to begin again, and the same events to be all reacted in the same order, is, on a miniature scale, represented in the history of the English Government in Ireland—every succeeding century being but a new revolution of the same follies, the same crimes, and the same turbulence that disgraced the former. But 'Vive l'ennemi!' say I: whoever may suffer by such measures, Captain Rock, at least, will prosper.

"And such was the result at the period of which I am speaking. The rejection of a petition, so humble and so reasonable, was followed, as a matter of course, by one of those daring rebellions into which the revenge of an insulted people naturally breaks forth. The M'Cartys, the O'Briens, and all the other Macs and O's, who have been kept on the alert by similar causes ever since, flew to arms under the command of a chieftain of my family; and, as the proffered *handle* of the sword had been rejected, made their inexorable masters at least feel its *edge*."—(pp. 23—25.)

Fifty years afterwards the same request was renewed and refused. Up again rose Mac and O,—a *just and necessary war* ensued; and after the usual murders, the usual chains were replaced upon the Irishry. All Irishmen were excluded from every species of office. It was high treason to marry with the Irish blood, and highly penal to receive the Irish into religious houses. War was waged also against their Thomas Moores, Samuel Rogerses, and Walter Scotts, who went about the country harping and singing against English oppression. No such turbulent guests were to be received. The plan of making them poets-laureate, or converting them to loyalty by pensions of 100*l.* per annum, had not then been thought of. They debarred the Irish even from the pleasure of running away, and fixed them to the soil like negroes.

"I have thus selected," says the historian of Rock, "cursorily and at random, a few features of the reigns preceding the Reformation, in order to show what good use was made of those three or four hundred years in attaching the Irish people to their English governors; and by what a gentle course of alteratives they were prepared for the inoculation of a new religion, which was now about to be attempted upon them by the same skilful and friendly hands.

"Henry the Seventh appears to have been the first monarch to whom it occurred

that matters were not managed exactly as they ought in this part of his dominions; and we find him—with a simplicity which is still fresh and youthful among our rulers—expressing his *surprise* that 'his subjects of this land should be so prone to faction and rebellion, and that so little advantage had been hitherto derived from the acquisitions of his predecessors, notwithstanding the fruitfulness and natural advantages of Ireland.'—Surprising, indeed, that a policy, such as we have been describing, should not have converted the whole country into a perfect Atlantis of happiness—should not have made it like the imaginary island of Sir Thomas More, where '*tota insula velut una familia est!*'—most stubborn, truly, and ungrateful, must that people be, upon whom, up to the very hour in which I write, such a long and unvarying course of penal laws, confiscations, and Insurrection Acts has been tried, without making them in the least degree in love with their rulers.

"Heloise tells her tutor Abelard, that the correction which he inflicted upon her only served to increase the ardour of her affection for him; but bayonets and hemp are no such '*amoris stimuli.*'—One more characteristic anecdote of those times, and I have done. At the battle of Knocktow, in the reign of Henry VII., when that remarkable man, the Earl of Kildare, assisted by the great O'Neal and other Irish chiefs, gained a victory over Clauricard of Connaught, most important to the English Government, Lord Gormanstown, after the battle, in the first insolence of success, said, turning to the Earl of Kildare, 'We have now slaughtered our enemies, but, to complete the good deed, we must proceed yet further, and—cut the throats of those Irish of our own party!'* Who can wonder that the Rock family were active in those times?"—(pp. 33—35.)

Henry VIII. persisted in all these outrages, and aggravated them by insulting the prejudices of the people. England is almost the only country in the world (even at present) where there is not some favourite religious spot, where absurd lies, little bits of cloth, feathers, rusty nails, splinters, and other invaluable relics, are treasured up, and in defence of which the whole population are willing to turn out and perish as one man. Such was the shrine of St. Kieran, the whole treasures of which the satellites of that corpulent tyrant turned out into the street, pillaged the sacred church of Clonmacnoise, scattered the holy nonsense of the priests to the winds, and burnt the real and venerable crosier of St. Patrick, fresh from the silversmith's shop, and formed of the most costly materials. Modern princes change the uniform of regiments: Henry changed the religion of kingdoms, and was determined that the belief of the Irish should undergo a radical and Protestant conversion. With what success this attempt was made, the present state of Ireland is sufficient evidence.

"Be not dismayed," said Elizabeth, on hearing that O'Neal meditated some designs against her government; "tell my friends, if he arise, it will turn to their advantage—*there will be estates for those who want.*" Soon after this prophetic speech, Munster was destroyed by famine and the sword, and near 600,000 acres forfeited to the Crown, and distributed among Englishmen. Sir Walter Raleigh (the virtuous and good) butchered the garrison of Limerick in cold blood, after Lord Deputy Gray had selected 700 to be hanged. There were, during the reign of Elizabeth, three invasions of Ireland by the Spaniards, produced principally by the absurd measures of this princess, for the reformation of its religion. The Catholic clergy, in consequence of these measures, abandoned their cures, the churches fell to ruin, and the people were left without any means of instruction. Add to these circumstances the murder of M'Mahon, the imprisonment of M'Toole* and O'Dogherty, and the kidnapping of O'Donnel—all truly Anglo-Hibernian proceedings. The execution of the laws was rendered detestable and intolerable by the queen's officers of jus-

* Leland gives this anecdote on the authority of an Englishman.

* There are not a few of the best and most humane Englishmen of the present day, who, when under the influence of fear or anger, would think it no great crime to put to death people whose names begin with O or Mac. The violent death of Smith, Green, or Thomson, would throw the neighbourhood into convulsions, and the regular forms would be adhered to—but little would be really thought of the death of anybody called O'Dogherty or O'Toole.

tice. The spirit raised by these transactions, besides innumerable smaller insurrections, gave rise to the great wars of Desmond and Hugh O'Neal; which, after they had worn out the ablest generals, discomfited the choicest troops, exhausted the treasure, and embarrassed the operations of Elizabeth, were terminated by the destruction of these two ancient families, and by the confiscation of more than half the territorial surface of the island. The two last years of O'Neal's wars cost Elizabeth 140,000*l.* per annum, though the whole revenue of England at that period fell considerably short of 500,000*l.* Essex, after the destruction of Norris, led into Ireland an army of above 20,000 men, which was totally baffled and destroyed by Tyrone within two years of their landing. Such was the importance of Irish rebellions two centuries before the time in which we live. Sir G. Carew attempted to assassinate the Lugan Earl — Mountjoy compelled the Irish rebels to massacre each other. In the course of a few months, 3000 men were starved to death in Tyrone. Sir Arthur Chichester, Sir Richard Manson, and other commanders, saw three children feeding on the flesh of their dead mother. Such were the golden days of good Queen Bess!

By the rebellions of Dogherty in the reign of James I. six northern counties were confiscated, amounting to 500,000 acres. In the same manner, 64,000 acres were confiscated in Athlone. The whole of his confiscations amount to nearly a million acres; and if Leland means plantation acres, they constitute a twelfth of the whole kingdom according to Newenham, and a tenth according to Sir W. Petty. The most shocking and scandalous action in the reign of James, was his attack upon the whole property of the province of Connaught, which he would have effected, if he had not been bought off by a sum greater than he hoped to gain by his iniquity, besides the luxury of confiscation. The Irish, during the reign of James I., suffered under the *double* evils of a licentious soldiery, and a religious persecution.

Charles I. took a bribe of 120,000*l.* from his Irish subjects, to grant them what in those days were called *Graces*, but in these days would be denominated the Elements of Justice. The money was paid, but the graces were never granted. One of these graces is curious enough: "That the clergy were not to be permitted to keep henceforward any private prisons of their own, but delinquents were to be committed to the public jails." The idea of a rector, with his own private jail full of dissenters, is the most ludicrous piece of tyranny we ever heard of. The troops in the beginning of Charles's reign were supported by the weekly fines levied upon the Catholics for non-attendance upon established worship. The Archbishop of Dublin went himself, at the head of a file of musketeers, to disperse a Catholic congregation in Dublin — which object he effected, after a considerable skirmish with the priests. "The favourite object" (says Dr. Leland, a Protestant clergyman, and dignitary of the Irish church) "of the Irish Government and the English Parliament, was *the utter extermination* of all the Catholic inhabitants of Ireland." The great rebellion took place in this reign, and Ireland was one scene of blood and cruelty and confiscation.

Cromwell began his career in Ireland by massacring for five days the garrison of Drogheda, to whom quarter had been promised. Two millions and a half of acres were confiscated. Whole towns were put up in lots, and sold. The Catholics were banished from three-fourths of the kingdom, and confined to Connaught. After a certain day, every Catholic found out of Connaught was to be punished with death. Fleetwood complains peevishly "that the people *do not transport readily*," — but adds, "*it is doubtless a work in which the Lord will appear.*" Ten thousand Irish were sent as recruits to the Spanish army.

"Such was *Cromwell's* way of settling the affairs of Ireland—and if a nation *is* to be ruined, this method is, perhaps, as good as any. It is, at least, more humane than the

slow lingering process of exclusion, disappointment, and degradation, by which their hearts are worn out under more specious forms of tyranny; and that talent of despatch which Molière attributes to one of his physicians, is no ordinary merit in a practitioner like Cromwell:—'C'est un homme expéditif, qui aime à dépêcher ses malades; et quand on a à mourir, cela se fait avec lui le plus vite du monde.' A certain military Duke, who complains that Ireland is but half-conquered, would, no doubt, upon an emergency, try his hand in the same line of practice, and, like that 'stern hero,' Mirmillo, in the Dispensary,

'While others meanly take whole months to slay,
Despatch the grateful patient in a day!'

"Among other amiable enactments against the Catholics at this period, the price of five pounds was set on the head of a Romish priest—being exactly the same sum offered by the same legislators for the head of a wolf. The Athenians, we are told, encouraged the destruction of wolves by a similar reward (five drachmas); but it does not appear that these heathens bought up the heads of priests at the same rate—such zeal in the cause of religion being reserved for times of Christianity and Protestantism."—(pp. 97—99.)

Nothing can show more strongly the light in which the Irish were held by Cromwell, than the correspondence with Henry Cromwell, respecting the peopling of Jamaica from Ireland. Secretary Thurloe sends to Henry, the Lord Deputy in Ireland, to inform him, that "a stock of Irish girls, and Irish young men, are wanting for the peopling of Jamaica." The answer of Henry Cromwell is as follows:—"Concerning the supply of young men, although we must use force in taking them up, *yet it being so much for their own good*, and likely to be of so great advantage to the public, it is not the least doubted but that you may have such a number of them as you may think fit to make use of on this account.

"I shall not need repeat anything respecting the girls, not doubting to answer your expectations to the full *in that*; and I think it might be of like advantage to your affairs there, and ours here, if you should think fit to send 1500 or 2000 boys to the place above mentioned. *We can well spare them*; and who knows but that it may be the means of making them Englishmen, I mean rather Christians? As for the girls, I suppose you will make provisions of clothes, and other accommodations for them." Upon this, Thurloe informs Henry Cromwell that the council have voted 4000 *girls, and as many boys*, to go to Jamaica.

Every Catholic priest found in Ireland was hanged, and five pounds paid to the informer.

"About the years 1652 and 1653," says Colonel Lawrence, in his *Interests of Ireland*, "the plague and famine had so swept away whole counties, that a man might travel twenty or thirty miles and not see a living creature, either man or beast, or bird, they being all dead, or had quitted those desolate places. Our soldiers would tell stories of the places where they saw smoke—it was so rare to see either smoke by day, or fire or candle by night." In this manner did the Irish live and die under Cromwell, suffering by the sword, famine, pestilence, and persecution, beholding the confiscation of a kingdom and the banishment of a race. "So that there perished" (says Sir W. Petty) "in the year 1641, 650,000 human beings whose blood somebody must atone for to God and the King!!"

In the reign of Charles II., by the Act of Settlement, four millions and a half of acres were for ever taken from the Irish. "This country," says the Earl of Essex, Lord Lieutenant in 1675, "has been perpetually rent and torn, since his Majesty's restoration. I can compare it to nothing better than the flinging the reward on the death of a deer among the pack of hounds—where every one pulls and tears where he can for himself." All wool grown in Ireland was, by Act of Parliament, compelled to be sold to England; and Irish cattle were excluded from England. The English, however, were pleased to accept 30,000 head of cattle, sent as a gift from Ireland to the sufferers in the great fire!—and the first day of the Sessions, after this act of munificence, the Parliament passed

fresh acts of exclusion against the productions of that country.

"Among the many anomalous situations in which the Irish have been placed, by those 'marriage vows, false as dicers' oaths,' which bind their country to England, the dilemma in which they found themselves at the Revolution was not the least perplexing or cruel.* If they were loyal to the King *de jure*, they were hanged by the King *de facto*; and if they escaped with life from the King *de facto*, it was but to be plundered and proscribed by the King *de jure* afterwards.

'Hac *gener* atque *socer* coeant mercede suorum.'—VIRGIL.

'In a manner so summary, prompt, and high-mettled,
Twixt father and son-in-law matters were settled.'

"In fact, most of the outlawries in Ireland were for treason committed the very day on which the Prince and Princess of Orange accepted the crown in the Banqueting-house; though the news of this event could not possibly have reached the other side of the Channel on the same day, and the Lord-Lieutenant of King James, with an army to enforce obedience, was at that time in actual possession of the government,—so little was common sense consulted, or the mere decency of forms observed, by that rapacious spirit, which nothing less than the confiscation of the whole island could satisfy; and which having, in the reign of James I. and at the Restoration, despoiled the natives of no less than ten million six hundred and thirty-six thousand eight hundred and thirty-seven acres, now added to its plunder one million sixty thousand seven hundred and ninety-two acres more, being the amount, altogether (according to Lord Clare's calculation), of the whole superficial contents of the island!

"Thus, not only had *all* Ireland suffered confiscation in the course of this century, but no inconsiderable portion of it had been twice and even thrice confiscated. Well might Lord Clare say, 'that the situation of the Irish nation, at the Revolution, stands unparalleled in the history of the inhabited world.'"—(pp. 111—113.)

By the Articles of Limerick, the Irish were promised the free exercise of their religion; but from that period till the year 1788, every year produced some fresh penalty against that religion—some liberty was abridged, some right impaired, or some suffering increased. By acts in King William's reign, they were prevented from being solicitors. No Catholic was allowed to marry a Protestant; and any Catholic who sent a son to Catholic countries for education was to forfeit all his lands. In the reign of Queen Anne, any son of a Catholic who chose to turn Protestant got possession of the father's estate. No Papist was allowed to purchase freehold property, or to take a lease for more than thirty years. If a Protestant dies intestate, the estate is to go to the next *Protestant* heir, though all to the tenth generation should be Catholic. In the same manner, if a Catholic dies intestate, his estate is to go to the next Protestant. No Papist is to dwell in Limerick or Galway. No Papist to take an annuity for life. The widow of a Papist turning Protestant to have a portion of the chattels of deceased, in spite of any will. Every Papist teaching schools to be presented as a regular Popish convict. Prices of catching Catholic priests from 50*s.* to 10*l.*, according to rank. Papists are to answer all questions respecting other Papists, or to be committed to jail for twelve months. No trust to be undertaken for Papists. No Papists to be on Grand Juries. Some notion may be formed of the spirit of those times, from an order of the House of Commons, "that the Sergeant-at-Arms should take into custody all Papists that should presume to come into *the gallery!*" (*Commons' Journal*, vol. iii. fol. 976.) During this reign, the English Parliament legislated as absolutely for Ireland as they do now for Rutlandshire—an evil not to be complained of, if they had done it as justly. In

* "Among the persons most puzzled and perplexed by the two opposite Royal claims on their allegiance, were the clergymen of the Established Church; who having first prayed for King James, as their lawful sovereign, as soon as William was proclaimed took to praying for *him;* but again, on the success of the Jacobite forces in the north, very prudently prayed for King James once more, till the arrival of Schomberg, when, as far as his quarters reached, they returned to praying for King William again."

the reign of George I., the horses of Papists were seized for the militia, and rode by Protestants; towards which the Catholics paid double, and were compelled to find Protestant substitutes. They were prohibited from voting at vestries, or being high or petty constables. An act of the English Parliament in this reign opens as follows: — "Whereas attempts have been lately made to shake off the subjection of Ireland to the Imperial Crown of these realms, be it enacted," &c. &c. In the reign of George II. four-sixths of the population were cut off from the right of voting at elections, by the necessity under which they were placed of taking the oath of supremacy. Barristers and solicitors marrying Catholics are exposed to all the penalties of Catholics. Persons robbed by privateers during a war with a Catholic State, are to be indemnified by a levy on the Catholic inhabitants of the neighbourhood. All marriages between Catholics and Protestants are annulled. All Popish priests celebrating them are to be hanged. "This system" (says Arthur Young) "has no other tendency than that of driving out of the kingdom all the personal wealth of the Catholics, and extinguishing their industry within it! and the face of the country, every object which presents itself to travellers, tells him how effectually this has been done." — (*Young's Tour in Ireland*, Vol. II. p. 48)

Such is the history of Ireland — for we are now at our own times; and the only remaining question is, whether the system of improvement and conciliation begun in the reign of George III. shall be pursued, and the remaining incapacities of the Catholics removed, or all these concessions be made insignificant by an adherence to that spirit of proscription which they professed to abolish? Looking to the sense and reason of the thing, and to the ordinary working of humanity and justice, when assisted, as they are here, by self-interest and worldly policy, it might seem absurd to doubt of the result. But looking to the facts and the persons by which we are now surrounded, we are constrained to say, that we greatly fear that these incapacities never will be removed, till they are removed by fear? What else, indeed, can we expect when we see them opposed by such enlightened men as Mr. Peel — faintly assisted by men of such admirable genius as Mr Canning, — when Royal Dukes consider it as a compliment to the memory of their father to continue this miserable system of bigotry and exclusion, — when men act ignominiously and contemptibly on this question, who do so on no other question,—when almost the only persons zealously opposed to this general baseness and fatuity are a few Whigs and Reviewers, or here and there a virtuous poet like Mr. Moore? We repeat again, that the measure never will be effected but by fear. In the midst of one of our just and necessary wars, the Irish Catholics will compel this country to grant them a great deal more than they at present require, or even contemplate. We regret most severely the protraction of the disease, — and the danger of the remedy; — but in this way it is that human affairs are carried on!

We are sorry we have nothing for which to praise Administration on the subject of the Catholic question — but, it is but justice to say, that they have been very zealous and active in detecting fiscal abuses in Ireland, in improving mercantile regulations, and in detecting Irish jobs. The commission on which Mr. Wallace presided has been of the greatest possible utility, and does infinite credit to the Government. The name of Mr. Wallace, in any commission, has now become a pledge to the public that there is a real intention to investigate and correct abuse. He stands in the singular predicament of being equally trusted by the rulers and the ruled. It is a new era in Government, when such men are called into action; and, if there were not proclaimed and fatal limits to that ministerial liberality — which, so far as it goes, we welcome without a grudge, and praise without a sneer — we might yet hope that, for the sake of mere consistency, they might be

led to falsify our forebodings. But alas! there are motives more immediate, and therefore irresistible; and the time is not yet come, when it will be believed easier to govern Ireland by the love of the many than by the power of the few — when the paltry and dangerous machinery of bigoted faction and prostituted patronage may be dispensed with, and the vessel of the state be propelled by the natural current of popular interests and the breath of popular applause. In the meantime, we cannot resist the temptation of gracing our conclusion with the following beautiful passage, in which the author alludes to the hopes that were raised at another great era of partial concession and liberality — that of the revolution of 1782,— when, also, benefits were conferred which proved abortive, because they were incomplete — and balm poured into the wound, where the envenomed shaft was yet left to rankle.

"And here," says the gallant Captain Rock, — "as the free confession of weaknesses constitutes the chief charm and use of biography—I will candidly own that the dawn of prosperity and concord, which I now saw breaking over the fortunes of my country, so dazzled and deceived my youthful eyes, and so unsettled every hereditary notion of what I owed to my name and family, that — shall I confess it? — I even hailed with pleasure the prospects of peace and freedom that seemed opening around me; nay, was ready, in the boyish enthusiasm of the moment, to sacrifice all my own personal interests in all future riots and rebellions, to the one bright, seducing object of my country's liberty and repose.

"When I contemplated such a man as the venerable Charlemont, whose nobility was to the people like a fort over a valley— elevated above them solely for their defence; who introduced the polish of the courtier into the camp of the freeman, and served his country with all that pure, Platonic devotion, which a true knight in the time of chivalry proffered to his mistress;—when I listened to the eloquence of Grattan, the very music of Freedom — her first, fresh matin song, after a long night of slavery, degradation, and sorrow;—when I saw the bright offerings which he brought to the shrine of his country, — wisdom, genius, courage, and patience, invigorated and embellished by all those social and domestic virtues, without which the loftiest talents stand isolated in the moral waste around them, like the pillars of Palmyra towering in a wilderness! — when I reflected on all this, it not only dishcartened me for the mission of discord which I had undertaken, but made me secretly hope that it might be rendered unnecessary; and that a country, which could produce such men and achieve such a revolution, might yet — in spite of the joint efforts of the Government and my family — take her rank in the scale of nations, and be happy!

"My father, however, who saw the momentary dazzle by which I was affected, soon drew me out of this false light of hope in which I lay basking, and set the truth before me in a way but too convincing and ominous. 'Be not deceived, boy,' he would say, 'by the fallacious appearances before you. Eminently great and good as is the man to whom Ireland owes this short era of glory, *our* work, believe me, will last longer than his. We have a power on our side that "will not willingly let us die;" and, long after Grattan shall have disappeared from earth, — like that arrow shot into the clouds by Alcestes — effecting nothing, but leaving a long train of light behind him, the family of the Rocks will continue to flourish in all their native glory, upheld by the ever-watchful care of the Legislature, and fostered by that "nursing mother of Liberty," the Church.'"

BENTHAM ON FALLACIES.

(E. Review, 1825.)

The Book of Fallacies: from Unfinished Papers of Jeremy Bentham. By a Friend. London. J. and H. L. Hunt. 1824.

There are a vast number of absurd and mischievous fallacies, which pass readily in the world for sense and virtue, while in truth they tend only to fortify error and encourage crime. Mr. Bentham has enumerated the most conspicuous of these in the book before us.

Whether it be necessary there should be a middleman between the cultivator and the possessor, learned economists have doubted; but neither gods, men, nor booksellers, can doubt the necessity of a middleman between Mr. Bentham and the public. Mr. Bentham is long; Mr. Bentham is occa-

sionally involved and obscure; Mr. Bentham invents new and alarming expressions; Mr. Bentham loves division and sub-division — and he loves method itself, more than its consequences. Those only, therefore, who know his originality, his knowledge, his vigour, and his boldness, will recur to the works themselves. The great mass of readers will not purchase improvement at so dear a rate; but will choose rather to become acquainted with Mr. Bentham through the medium of Reviews — after that eminent philosopher has been washed, trimmed, shaved, and forced into clean linen. One great use of a Review, indeed, is to make men wise in ten pages, who have no appetite for a hundred pages; to condense nourishment, to work with pulp and essence, and to guard the stomach from idle burden and unmeaning bulk. For half a page, sometimes for a whole page, Mr. Bentham writes with a power which few can equal; and by selecting and omitting, an admirable style may be formed from the text. Using this liberty, we shall endeavour to give an account of Mr. Bentham's doctrines, for the most part in his own words. Wherever any expression is particularly happy, let it be considered to be Mr. Bentham's: — the dulness we take to ourselves.

Our Wise Ancestors — the Wisdom of our Ancestors — the Wisdom of Ages — venerable Antiquity — Wisdom of Old Times. — This mischievous and absurd fallacy springs from the grossest perversion of the meaning of words. Experience is certainly the mother of wisdom, and the old have, of course, a greater experience than the young; but the question is, who are the old? and who are the young? Of *individuals* living at the same period, the oldest has, of course, the greatest experience; but among *generations* of men the reverse of this is true. Those who come first (our ancestors) are the young people, and have the least experience. We have added to their experience the experience of many centuries; and, therefore, as far as experience goes, are wiser, and more capable of forming an opinion than they were. The real feeling should be, *not*, can we be so presumptuous as to put our opinions in opposition to those of our ancestors? but can such young, ignorant, and inexperienced persons, as our ancestors necessarily were, be expected to have understood a subject as well as those who have seen so much more, lived so much longer, and enjoyed the experience of so many centuries? All this cant, then, about our ancestors is merely an abuse of words, by transferring phrases true of contemporary men to succeeding ages. Whereas (as we have before observed) of living men the oldest has, *cæteris paribus*, the most experience; of generations, the oldest has, *cæteris paribus*, the least experience. Our ancestors, up to the Conquest, were children in arms; chubby boys in the time of Edward I.; striplings under Elizabeth; men in the reign of Queen Anne; and *we* only are the white-bearded, silver-headed ancients, who have treasured up, and are prepared to profit by, all the experience which human life can supply. We are not disputing with our ancestors the palm of talent, in which they may or may not be our superiors, but the palm of experience, in which it is utterly impossible they can be our superiors. And yet, whenever the Chancellor comes forward to protect some abuse, or to oppose some plan which has the increase of human happiness for its object, his first appeal is always to the wisdom of our ancestors; and he himself, and many noble lords who vote with him, are, to this hour, persuaded that all alterations and amendments on their devices are an unblushing controversy between youthful temerity and mature experience!— and so, in truth, they are, — only that much-loved magistrate mistakes the young for the old, and the old for the young — and is guilty of that very sin against experience which he attributes to the lovers of innovation.

We cannot, of course, be supposed to maintain that our ancestors wanted wisdom, or that they were necessarily mistaken in their institutions, because their means of information were more

limited than ours. But we do confidently maintain that when we find it expedient to change anything which our ancestors have enacted, we are the experienced persons, and not they. The quantity of talent is always varying in any great nation. To say that we are more or less able than our ancestors, is an assertion that requires to be explained. All the able men of all ages, who have ever lived in England, probably possessed, if taken altogether, more intellect than all the able men now in England can boast of. But if authority must be resorted to rather than reason, the question is, What was the wisdom of that single age which enacted the law, compared with the wisdom of the age which proposes to alter it? What are the eminent men of one and the other period? If you say that our ancestors were wiser than us, mention your date and year. If the splendour of names is equal, are the circumstances the same? If the circumstances are the same, we have a superiority of experience, of which the difference between the two periods is the measure. It is necessary to insist upon this; for upon sacks of wool, and on benches forensic, sit grave men, and agricolous persons in the Commons, crying out "Ancestors, Ancestors! *hodie non!* Saxons, Danes, save us! Fiddlefrig, help us! Howel, Ethelwolf, protect us!"— Any cover for nonsense — any veil for trash — any pretext for repelling the innovations of conscience and of duty!

"So long as they keep to vague generalities—so long as the two objects of comparison are each of them taken in the lump—wise ancestors in one lump, ignorant and foolish mob of modern times in the other—the weakness of the fallacy may escape detection. But let them assign for the period of superior wisdom any determinate period whatsoever, not only will the groundlessness of the notion be apparent (class being compared with class in that period and the present one), but, unless the antecedent period be comparatively speaking a very modern one, so wide will be the disparity, and to such an amount in favour of modern times, that, in comparison of the lowest class of the people in modern times, (always supposing them proficients in the art of reading, and their proficiency employed in the reading of newspapers,) the very highest and best informed class of these wise ancestors will turn out to be grossly ignorant.

"Take, for example, any year in the reign of Henry the Eighth, from 1509 to 1546. At that time the House of Lords would probably have been in possession of by far the larger proportion of what little instruction the age afforded: in the House of Lords, among the laity, it might even then be a question whether, without exception, their lordships were all of them able so much as to read. But even supposing them all in the fullest possession of that useful art, political science being the science in question, what instruction on the subject could they meet with at that time of day?

"On no one branch of legislation was any book extant from which, with regard to the circumstances of the then present times, any useful instruction could be derived: distributive law, penal law, international law, political economy, so far from existing as sciences, had scarcely obtained a name: in all those departments, under the head of *quid faciendum*, a mere blank: the whole literature of the age consisted of a meagre chronicle or two, containing short memorandums of the usual occurrences of war and peace, battles, sieges, executions, revels, deaths, births, processions, ceremonies, and other external events; but with scarce a speech or an incident that could enter into the composition of any such work as a history of the human mind—with scarce an attempt at investigation into causes, characters, or the state of the people at large. Even when at last, little by little, a scrap or two of political instruction came to be obtainable, the proportion of error and mischievous doctrine mixed up with it was so great, that whether a blank unfilled might not have been less prejudicial than a blank thus filled, may reasonably be matter of doubt.

"If we come down to the reign of James the First, we shall find that Solomon of his time, eminently eloquent as well as learned, not only among crowned but among uncrowned heads, marking out for prohibition and punishment the practices of devils and witches, and without any the slightest objection on the part of the great characters of that day in their high situations, consigning men to death and torment for the misfortune of not being so well acquainted as he was with the composition of the Godhead.

"Under the name of Exorcism the Catholic liturgy contains a form of procedure for driving out devils;—even with the help

of this instrument, the operation cannot be performed with the desired success, but by an operator qualified by holy orders for the working of this as well as so many other wonders. In our days, and in our country, the same object is attained, and beyond comparison more effectually, by so cheap an instrument as a common newspaper: before this talisman, not only devils, but ghosts, vampires, witches, and all their kindred tribes, are driven out of the land, never to return again! The touch of holy water is not so intolerable to them as the bare smell of printers' ink."—(pp. 74—77.)

Fallacy of irrevocable Laws. — A law, says Mr. Bentham (no matter to what effect), is proposed to a legislative assembly, who are called upon to reject it, upon the single ground, that by those who in some former period exercised the same power, a regulation was made, having for its object to preclude for ever, or to the end of an unexpired period, all succeeding legislators from enacting a law to any such effect as that now proposed.

Now it appears quite evident that, at every period of time, every Legislature must be endowed with all those powers which the exigency of the times may require: and any attempt to infringe on this power is inadmissible and absurd. The sovereign power, at any one period, can only form a blind guess at the measures which may be necessary for any future period: but by this principle of immutable laws, the government is transferred from those who are necessarily the best judges of what they want, to others who can know little or nothing about the matter. The thirteenth century decides for the fourteenth. The fourteenth makes laws for the fifteenth. The fifteenth hermetically seals up the sixteenth, which tyrannises over the seventeenth, which again tells the eighteenth how it is to act, under circumstances which cannot be foreseen, and how it is to conduct itself in exigencies which no human wit can anticipate.

"Men who have a century more of experience to ground their judgments on, surrender their intellect to men who had a century less experience, and who, unless that deficiency constitutes a claim, have no claim to preference. If the prior generation were, in respect of intellectual qualification, ever so much superior to the subsequent generation—if it understood so much better than the subsequent generation itself the interest of that subsequent generation—could it have been in an equal degree anxious to promote that interest, and consequently equally attentive to those facts with which, though in order to form a judgment it ought to have been, it is impossible that it should have been acquainted? In a word, will its love for that subsequent generation be quite so great as that same generation's love for itself?

"Not even here, after a moment's deliberate reflection, will the assertion be in the affirmative. And yet it is their prodigious anxiety for the welfare of their posterity that produces the propensity of these sages to tie up the hands of this same posterity for evermore—to act as guardians to its perpetual and incurable weakness, and take its conduct for ever out of its own hands.

"If it be right that the conduct of the 19th century should be determined not by its own judgment, but by that of the 18th, it will be equally right that the conduct of the 20th century should be determined, not by its own judgment, but by that of the 19th. And if the same principle were still pursued, what at length would be the consequence?—that in process of time the practice of legislation would be at an end. The conduct and fate of all men would be determined by those who neither knew nor cared anything about the matter; and the aggregate body of the Living would remain for ever in subjection to an inexorable tyranny, exercised, as it were, by the aggregate body of the Dead."—(pp. 84—86.)

The despotism, as Mr. Bentham well observes, of Nero or Caligula, would be more tolerable than an *irrevocable law.* The despot, through fear or favour, or in a lucid interval, might relent; but how are the Parliament, who made the Scotch Union, for example, to be awakened from that dust in which they repose — the jobber and the patriot, the speaker and the doorkeeper, the silent voters and the men of rich allusions — Cannings and cultivators, Barings and beggars — making irrevocable laws for men who toss their remains about with spades, and use the relics of these legislators, to give breadth to broccoli, and to aid the vernal eruption of asparagus?

If the law be good, it will support itself; if bad, it should not be supported by the *irrevocable theory*, which is never resorted to but as the veil of abuses. All living men must possess the supreme power over their own happiness at every particular period. To suppose that there is anything which a whole nation cannot do, which they deem to be essential to their happiness, and that they cannot do it, because *another* generation, long ago dead and gone, said it must not be done, is mere nonsense. While you are captain of the vessel, do what you please; but the moment you quit the ship, I become as omnipotent as you. You may leave me as much *advice* as you please, but you cannot leave me *commands;* though, in fact, this is the only meaning which can be applied to what are called irrevocable laws. It appeared to the Legislature for the time being to be of immense importance to make such and such a law. Great good was gained or great evil avoided by enacting it. Pause before you alter an institution which has been deemed to be of so much importance. This is prudence and common sense; the rest is the exaggeration of fools, or the artifice of knaves. who eat up fools. What endless nonsense has been talked of our navigation laws! What wealth has been sacrificed to either before they were repealed! How impossible it appeared to Noodledom to repeal them! They were considered of the irrevocable class — a kind of law over which the dead only were omnipotent, and the living had no power. Frost, it is true, cannot be put off by act of Parliament, nor can Spring be accelerated by any majority of both Houses. It is, however, quite a mistake to suppose that any alteration of any of the Articles of Union is as much out of the jurisdiction of Parliament as these meteorological changes. In every year, and every day of that year, living men have a right to make their own laws, and manage their own affairs; to break through the tyranny of the ante-spirants — the people who breathed before them, and to do what they please for themselves. Such supreme power cannot indeed be well exercised by the people at large; it must be exercised therefore by the delegates, or Parliament, whom the people choose; and such Parliament, disregarding the superstitious reverence for *irrevocable laws*, can have no other criterion of wrong and right than that of public utility.

When a law is considered as immutable; and the immutable law happens at the same time to be too foolish and mischievous to be endured, instead of being repealed, it is clandestinely evaded, or openly violated; and thus the authority of all law is weakened.

Where a nation has been anecestorially bound by foolish and improvident treaties, ample notice must be given of their termination. Where the state has made ill-advised grants, or rash bargains with individuals, it is necessary to grant proper compensation. The most difficult case, certainly, is that of the union of nations, where a smaller number of the weaker nation is admitted into the larger senate of the greater nation, and will be overpowered if the question come to a vote; but the lesser nation must run this risk: it is not probable that any violation of articles will take place till they are absolutely called for by extreme necessity. But let the danger be what it may, no danger is so great, no supposition so foolish, as to consider any human law as irrevocable. The shifting attitude of human affairs would often render such a condition an intolerable evil to all parties. The absurd jealousy of our countrymen at the Union secured heritable jurisdiction to the owners; nine and thirty years afterwards they were abolished in the very teeth of the Act of Union, and to the evident promotion of the public good.

Continuity of a Law by Oath. — The Sovereign of England at his Coronation takes an oath to maintain the laws of God, the true profession of the Gospel, and the Protestant religion as established by law, and to preserve to the Bishops and Clergy of this realm the rights and privileges which by

law appertain to them, and to preserve inviolate the doctrine, discipline, worship, and government of the Church. It has been suggested that by this oath the King stands precluded from granting those indulgences to the Irish Catholics which are included in the bill for their emancipation. The true meaning of these provisions is, of course, to be decided, if doubtful, by the same legislative authority which enacted them. But a different notion it seems is now afloat. The King for the time being (we are putting an imaginary case) thinks as an individual, that he is not maintaining the doctrine, discipline, and rights of the Church of England, if he grant any extension of civil rights to those who are not members of that Church, that he is violating his oath by so doing. This oath, then, according to this reasoning, is the great palladium of the Church. As long as it remains inviolate the Church is safe. How then can any monarch who has taken it ever consent to repeal it? How can he, consistently with his oath for the preservation of the privileges of the Church, contribute his part to throw down so strong a bulwark as he deems this oath to be? The oath, then, cannot be altered. It must remain under all circumstances of society the same. The King, who has taken it, is bound to continue it, and to refuse his sanction to any bill for its future alteration; because it prevents him, and he must needs think, will prevent others, from granting dangerous immunities to the enemies of the Church.

Here, then, is an irrevocable law — a piece of absurd tyranny exercised by the rulers of Queen Anne's time upon the government of 1825 — a certain art of potting and preserving a kingdom, in one shape, attitude and flavour — and in this way it is that an institution appears like old Ladies' Sweetmeats and made Wines — Apricot Jam, 1822 — Currant Wine, 1819 — Court of Chancery, 1427 — Penal Laws against Catholics, 1676. The difference is, that the Ancient Woman is a better judge of mouldy commodities than the liberal part of his Majesty's Ministers. The potting lady goes sniffing about, and admitting light and air to prevent the progress of decay; while to him of the Woolsack, all seems doubly dear in proportion as it is antiquated, worthless, and unusable. It ought not to be in the power of the Sovereign to tie up his own hands, much less the hands of his successors. If the Sovereign is to oppose his own opinion to that of the two other branches of the Legislature, and himself to decide what he considers to be for the benefit of the Protestant Church, and what not, a king who has spent his whole life in the frivolous occupation of a court, may, by perversion of understanding, conceive measures most salutary to the Church to be most pernicious; and persevering obstinately in his own error, may frustrate the wisdom of his Parliament, and perpetuate the most inconceivable folly! If Henry VIII. had argued in this manner, we should have had no Reformation. If George III. had always argued in this manner, the Catholic Code would never have been relaxed. And thus, a king, however incapable of forming an opinion upon serious subjects, has nothing to do but to pronounce the word *Conscience*, and the whole power of the country is at his feet.

Can there be greater absurdity than to say that a man is acting contrary to his conscience who surrenders his opinion upon any subject to those who must understand the subject better than himself? I think my ward has a claim to the estate; but the best lawyers tell me he has none. I think my son capable of undergoing the fatigues of a military life; but the best physicians say he is much too weak. My Parliament say this measure will do the Church no harm; but I think it very pernicious to the Church. Am I acting contrary to my conscience because I apply much higher intellectual powers than my own to the investigation and protection of these high interests?

"According to the form in which it is conceived, any such engagement is in effect

either a check or a licence:—a licence under the appearance of a check, and for that very reason but the more efficiently operative.

"Chains to the man in power? Yes:—but only such as he figures with on the stage: to the spectators as imposing, to himself as light as possible. Modelled by the wearer to suit his own purposes, they serve to rattle, but not to restrain.

"Suppose a King of Great Britain and Ireland to have expressed his fixed determination, in the event of any proposed law being tendered to him for his assent, to refuse such assent, and this not on the persuasion that the law would not be 'for the utility of the subjects,' but that by his coronation oath he stands precluded from so doing:—the course proper to be taken by parliament, the course pointed out by principle and precedent, would be, a vote of abdication:—a vote declaring the king to have abdicated his royal authority, and that, as in case of death or incurable mental derangement, now is the time for the person next in succession to take his place.

"In the celebrated case in which a vote to this effect was actually passed, the declaration of abdication was in lawyers' language a fiction—in plain truth a falsehood—and that falsehood a mockery; not a particle of his power was it the wish of James to abdicate, to part with; but to increase it to a maximum was the manifest object of all his efforts. But in the case here supposed, with respect to a part, and that a principal part, of the royal authority, the will and purpose to abdicate is actually declared: and this, being such a part, without which the remainder cannot, 'to the utility of the subjects,' be exercised, the remainder must of necessity be, on their part, and for their sake, added."—(pp. 110, 111.)

Self-Trumpeter's Fallacy.—Mr. Bentham explains the self-trumpeter's fallacy as follows:—

"There are certain men in office who, in discharge of their functions, arrogate to themselves a degree of probity, which is to exclude all imputations and all inquiry. Their assertions are to be deemed equivalent to proof; their virtues are guarantees for the faithful discharge of their duties; and the most implicit confidence is to be reposed in them on all occasions. If you expose any abuse, propose any reform, call for securities, inquiry, or measures to promote publicity, they set up a cry of surprise, amounting almost to indignation, as if their integrity were questioned, or their honour wounded. With all this, they dexterously mix up intimations, that the most exalted patriotism, honour, and perhaps religion, are the only sources of all their actions."—(p. 120.)

Of course every man will try what he can effect by these means; but (as Mr. Bentham observes) if there be any one maxim in politics more certain than another, it is that no possible degree of virtue in the governor can render it expedient for the governed to dispense with good laws and good institutions. Madame de Stael (to her disgrace) said to the Emperor of Russia, "Sire, your character is a constitution for your country, and your conscience its guarantee." His reply was, "Quand cela serait, je ne serais jamais qu'un accident heureux;" and this we think one of the truest and most brilliant replies ever made by monarch.

Laudatory Personalities.—"The object of laudatory personalities is to effect the rejection of a measure on account of the alleged good character of those who oppose it: and the argument advanced is, 'The measure is rendered unnecessary by the virtues of those who are in power—their opposition is a sufficient authority for the rejection of the measure. The measure proposed implies a distrust of the members of His Majesty's Government; but so great is their integrity, so complete their disinterestedness, so uniformly do they prefer the public advantage to their own, that such a measure is altogether unnecessary. Their disapproval is sufficient to warrant an opposition; precautions can only be requisite where danger is apprehended: here, the high character of the individuals in question is a sufficient guarantee against any ground of alarm.'"—(pp. 123, 124.)

The panegyric goes on increasing with the dignity of the lauded person. All are honourable and delightful men. The person who opens the door of the office is a person of approved fidelity; the junior clerk is a model of assiduity; all the clerks are models—seven years' models, eight years' models, nine years' models and upwards. The first clerk is a paragon—and ministers the very perfection of probity and intelligence; and as for the highest magistrate of the state, no adulation is equal to describe the extent of his various merits! It is too condescending perhaps to

refute such folly as this. But we would just observe, that if the propriety of the measure in question be established by direct arguments, these must be at least as conclusive against the character of those who oppose it, as their character can be against the measure.

The effect of such an argument is, to give men of good or reputed good character the power of putting a negative on any question—not agreeable to their inclinations.

"In every public trust, the legislator should, for the purpose of prevention, suppose the trustee disposed to break the trust in every imaginable way in which it would be possible for him to reap, from the breach of it, any personal advantage. This is the principle on which public institutions ought to be formed; and when it is applied to all men indiscriminately, it is injurious to none. The practical inference is, to oppose to such possible (and what will always be probable) breaches of trust, every bar that can be opposed, consistently with the power requisite for the efficient and due discharge of the trust. Indeed, these arguments, drawn from the supposed virtues of men in power, are opposed to the first principles on which all laws proceed.

"Such allegations of individual virtue are never supported by specific proof, are scarce ever susceptible of specific disproof; and specific disproof, if offered, could not be admitted in either House of Parliament. If attempted elsewhere, the punishment woul fall, not on the unworthy trustee, but on him by whom the unworthiness had been proved."—(pp. 125, 126.)

Fallacies of pretended danger. — Imputation of bad design — of bad character — of bad motives — of inconsistency — of suspicious connections.

The object of this class of fallacies is to draw aside attention from the measure to the man, and this in such a manner, that, for some real or supposed defect in the author of the measure, a corresponding defect shall be imputed to the measure itself. Thus, "the author of the measure entertains a bad design; therefore the measure is bad. His character is bad, therefore the measure is bad; his motive is bad, I will vote against the measure. On former occasions this same person who proposed the measure was its enemy, therefore the measure is bad. He is on a footing of intimacy with this or that dangerous man, or has been seen in his company, or is suspected of entertaining some of his opinions, therefore the measure is bad. He bears a name that at a former period was borne by a set of men now no more, by whom bad principles were entertained—therefore the measure is bad!"

Now, if the measure be really inexpedient, why not at once show it to be so? If the measure be good, is it bad because a bad man is its author? If bad, is it good because a good man has produced it? What are these arguments, but to say to the assembly who are to be the judges of any measure, that their imbecility is too great to allow them to judge of the measure by its own merits, and that they must have recourse to distant and feebler probabilities for that purpose?

"In proportion to the degree of efficiency with which a man suffers these instruments of deception to operate upon his mind he enables bad men to exercise over him a sort of power, the thought of which ought to cover him with shame. Allow this argument the effect of a conclusive one, you put it into the power of any man to draw you at pleasure from the support of every measure, which in your own eyes is good, to force you to give your support to any and every measure which in your own eyes is bad. Is it good?—the bad man embraces it, and, by the supposition, you reject it. Is it bad?—he vituperates it, and that suffices for driving you into its embrace. You split upon the rocks, because he has avoided them; you miss the harbour, because he has steered into it! Give yourself up to any such blind antipathy, you are no less in the power of your adversaries, than if, by a correspondently irrational sympathy and obsequiousness, you put yourself into the power of your friends."—(pp. 132, 133.)

"Besides, nothing but laborious application, and a clear and comprehensive intellect, can enable a man, on any given subject, to employ successfully relevant arguments drawn from the subject itself. To employ personalities, neither labour nor intellect is required. In this sort of contest, the most idle and the most ignorant are quite on a par with, if not superior to, the most industrious and the most highly-gifted individuals. Nothing can be more conveuient for those who would speak without the trouble of thinking. The same ideas are brought

forward over and over again, and all that is required is to vary the turn of expression. Close and relevant arguments have very little hold on the passions, and serve rather to quell than to inflame them; while in personalities there is always something stimulant, whether on the part of him who praises or him who blames. Praise forms a kind of connection between the party praising and the party praised, and vituperation gives an air of courage and independence to the party who blames.

"Ignorance and indolence, friendship and enmity, concurring and conflicting interest, servility and independence, all conspire to give personalities the ascendency they so unhappily maintain. The more we lie under the influence of our own passions, the more we rely on others being affected in a similar degree. A man who can repel these injuries with dignity, may often convert them into triumph: 'Strike me, but hear,' says he, and the fury of his antagonist redounds to his own discomfiture."—(pp. 141, 142.)

No Innovation!—To say that all new things are bad, is to say that all old things were bad in their commencement: for of all the old things ever seen or heard of, there is not one that was not once new. Whatever is now establishment was once innovation. The first inventor of pews and parish clerks, was no doubt considered as a Jacobin in his day. Judges, juries, criers of the court, are all the inventions of ardent spirits, who filled the world with alarm, and were considered as the great precursors of ruin and dissolution. No inoculation, no turnpikes, no reading, no writing, no Popery! The fool sayeth in his heart, and crieth with his mouth, "I will have nothing new!"

Fallacy of Distrust!—"*What's at the Bottom?*"—This fallacy begins with a virtual admission of the propriety of the measure considered in itself, and thus demonstrates its own futility, and cuts up from under itself the ground which it endeavours to make. A measure is to be rejected for something that, by bare possibility, may be found amiss in some other measure! This is vicarious reprobation; upon this principle Herod instituted his massacre. It is the argument of a driveller to other drivellers, who says, We are not able to decide upon the evil when it arises—our only safe way is to act upon the general apprehension of evil.

Official Malefactor's Screen.—"*Attack us—you attack Government.*"

If this notion is acceded to, every one who derives at present any advantage from misrule has it in fee-simple; and all abuses, present and future, are without remedy. So long as there is anything amiss in conducting the business of Government, so long as it can be made better, there can be no other mode of bringing it nearer to perfection than the indication of such imperfections as at the time being exist.

"But so far is it from being true that a man's aversion or contempt for the hands by which the powers of Government, or even for the system under which they are exercised, is a proof of his aversion or contempt towards Government itself, that, even in proportion to the strength of that aversion or contempt, it is a proof of the opposite affection. What, in consequence of such contempt or aversion, he wishes for, is, not that there be no hands at all to exercise these powers, but that the hands may be better regulated;—not that those powers should not be exercised at all, but that they should be better exercised;—not that in the exercise of them, no rules at all should be pursued, but that the rules by which they are exercised should be a better set of rules.

"All government is a trust; every branch of government is a trust; and immemorially acknowledged so to be: it is only by the magnitude of the scale that public differ from private trusts. I complain of the conduct of a person in the character of guardian, as domestic guardian, having the care of a minor or insane person. In so doing, do I say that guardianship is a bad institution? Does it enter into the head of any one to suspect me of so doing? I complain of an individual in the character of a commercial agent, or assignee of the effects of an insolvent. In so doing, do I say that commercial agency is a bad thing? that the practice of vesting in the hands of trustees or assignees the effects of an insolvent, for the purpose of their being divided among his creditors, is a bad practice? Does any such conceit ever enter into the head of man, as that of suspecting me of so doing?"—(pp. 162, 163.)

There are no complaints against government in Turkey—no motions in Parliament, no Morning Chronicles,

and no Edinburgh Reviews: yet of all countries in the world, it is that in which revolts and revolutions are the most frequent.

It is so far from true, that no good government can exist consistently with such disclosure, that no good government can exist without it. It is quite obvious, to all who are capable of reflection, that by no other means than by lowering the governors in the estimation of the people, can there be hope or chance of beneficial change. To infer from this wise endeavour to lessen the existing rulers in the estimation of the people, a wish of dissolving the government, is either artifice or error. The physician who intentionally weakens the patient by bleeding him has no intention he should perish.

The greater the quantity of respect a man receives, independently of good conduct, the less good is his behaviour likely to be. It is the interest, therefore, of the public, in the case of each, to see that the respect paid to him should, as completely as possible, depend upon the goodness of his behaviour in the execution of his trust. But it is, on the contrary, the interest of the trustee, that the respect, the money, or any other advantage he receives in virtue of his office, should be as great, as secure, and as independent of conduct as possible. Soldiers expect to be shot at; public men must expect to be attacked, and sometimes unjustly. It keeps up the habit of considering their conduct as exposed to scrutiny; on the part of the people at large, it keeps alive the expectation of witnessing such attacks, and the habit of looking out for them. The friends and supporters of government have always greater facility in keeping and raising it up, than its adversaries have for lowering it.

Accusation-scarer's Device.—"*Infamy must attach somewhere.*"

This fallacy consists in representing the character of a calumniator as necessarily and justly attaching upon him who, having made a charge of misconduct against any persons possessed of political power or influence, fails of producing evidence sufficient for their conviction.

"If taken as a general proposition, applying to all public accusations, nothing can be more mischievous as well as fallacious. Supposing the charge unfounded, the delivery of it may have been accompanied with *mala fides* (consciousness of its injustice), with *temerity* only, or it may have been perfectly blameless. It is in the first case alone that infamy can with propriety attach upon him who brings it forward. A charge really groundless may have been honestly *believed* to be well founded, *i.e.* believed with a sort of provisional credence, sufficient for the purpose of engaging a man to do his part towards the bringing about an investigation, but without sufficient reasons. But a charge may be perfectly groundless without attaching the smallest particle of blame upon him who brings it forward. Suppose him to have heard from one or more, presenting themselves to him in the character of percipient witnesses, a story, which either *in toto*, or perhaps only in *circumstances*, though in circumstances of the most material importance, should prove false and mendacious—how is the person who hears this, and acts accordingly, to blame? What sagacity can enable a man previously to legal investigation, a man who has no power that can enable him to insure correctness or completeness on the part of this extra-judicial testimony, to guard against deception in such a case?"—(pp. 185, 186.)

Fallacy of False Consolation.—"*What is the matter with you?—What would you have? Look at the people there, and there; think how much better off you are than they are. Your prosperity and liberty are objects of their envy; your institutions models of their imitation.*"

It is not the desire to look to the bright side that is blamed: but when a particular suffering, produced by an assigned cause, has been pointed out, the object of many apologists is to turn the eyes of inquirers and judges into any other quarter in preference. If a man's tenants were to come with a general encomium on the prosperity of the country, instead of a specified sum, would it be accepted? In a court of justice, in an action for damages, did ever any such device occur as that of pleading assets in the hands of a third person? There is, in fact, no country so poor and so wretched in every

element of prosperity, in which matter for this argument might not be found. Were the prosperity of the country tenfold as great as at present, the absurdity of the argument would not in the least degree be lessened. Why should the smallest evil be endured, which can be cured, because others suffer patiently under greater evils? Should the smallest improvement attainable be neglected, because others remain contented in a state of still greater inferiority?

"Seriously and pointedly in the character of a bar to any measure of relief, no, nor to the most trivial improvement, can it ever be employed. Suppose a bill brought in for converting an impassable road anywhere into a passable one, would any man stand up to oppose it who could find nothing better to urge against it than the multitude and goodness of the roads we have already? No: when in the character of a serious bar to the measure in hand, be that measure what it may, an argument so palpably inapplicable is employed, it can only be for the purpose of creating a diversion;—of turning aside the minds of men from the subject really in hand, to a picture, which by its beauty, it is hoped, may engross the attention of the assembly, and make them forget for the moment for what purpose they came there."—(pp. 196, 197.)

The Quietist, or no Complaint.—"A new law or measure being proposed in the character of a remedy for some incontestable abuse or evil, an objection is frequently started to the following effect:—'The measure is unnecessary. Nobody complains of disorder in that shape, in which it is the aim of your measure to propose a remedy to it. But even when *no* cause of complaint has been found to exist, especially under governments which admit of complaints, men have in general not been slow to complain; much less where any just cause of complaint has existed.' The argument amounts to this:—Nobody complains, therefore nobody suffers. It amounts to a *veto* on all measures of precaution or prevention, and goes to establish a maxim in legislation directly opposed to the most ordinary prudence of common life;—it enjoins us to build no parapets to a bridge till the number of accidents has raised an universal clamour."—(pp. 190, 191.)

Procrastinator's Argument.—"*Wait a little, this is not the time.*"

This is the common argument of men, who, being in reality hostile to a measure, are ashamed or afraid of appearing to be so. *To-day* is the plea —*eternal exclusion* commonly the object. It is the same sort of quirk as a plea of abatement in law—which is never employed but on the side of a dishonest defendant, whose hope it is to obtain an ultimate triumph by overwhelming his adversary with despair, impoverishment, and lassitude. Which is the properest day to do good? which is the properest day to remove a nuisance? we answer, the very first day a man can be found to propose the removal of it; and whoever opposes the removal of it on that day will (if he dare) oppose it on every other. There is in the minds of many feeble friends to virtue and improvement, an imaginary period for the removal of evils, which it would certainly be worth while to wait for, if there was the smallest chance of its ever arriving—a period of unexampled peace and prosperity, when a patriotic king and an enlightened mob united their ardent efforts for the amelioration of human affairs; when the oppressor is as delighted to give up the oppression, as the oppressed is to be liberated from it; when the difficulty and the unpopularity would be to continue the evil, not to abolish it! These are the periods when fair-weather philosophers are willing to venture out, and hazard a little for the general good. But the history of human nature is so contrary to all this, that almost all improvements are made after the bitterest resistance, and in the midst of tumults and civil violence—the worst period at which they can be made, compared to which any period is eligible, and should be seized hold of by the friends of salutary reform.

Snail's Pace argument.—"*One thing at a time! Not too fast! Slow and sure!*—Importance of the business—extreme difficulty of the business—danger of innovation—need of caution and circumspection—impossibility of foreseeing all consequences—danger of precipitation—everything should be gradual—one thing at a time—this is not the time—great occupation at present—wait for more leisure—people well satisfied—no petitions presented—no complaints heard—no such mischief has yet taken place—stay till it has taken place!—Such is the

prattle which the magpie in office, who, understanding nothing, yet understands that he must have something to say on every subject, shouts out among his auditors as a succedaneum to thought."—(pp. 203, 204.)

Vague Generalities.—Vague generalities comprehend a numerous class of fallacies resorted to by those who, in preference to the determinate expressions which they might use, adopt others more vague and indeterminate.

Take, for instance, the terms, government, laws, morals, religion. Everybody will admit that there are in the world bad governments, bad laws, bad morals, and bad religions. The bare circumstance, therefore, of being engaged in exposing the defects of government, law, morals, and religion, does not of itself afford the slightest presumption that a writer is engaged in anything blamable. If his attack be only directed against that which is bad in each, his efforts may be productive of good to any extent. This essential distinction, however, the defender of abuses uniformly takes care to keep out of sight; and boldly imputes to his antagonists an intention to subvert all *government, law, morals, and religion.* Propose anything with a view to the improvement of the existing practice, in relation to law, government, and religion, he will treat you with an oration upon the necessity and utility of law, government, and religion. Among the several cloudy appellatives which have been commonly employed as cloaks for misgovernment, there is none more conspicuous in this atmosphere of illusion than the word order. As often as any measure is brought forward which has for its object to lessen the sacrifice made by the many to the few, *social order* is the phrase commonly opposed to its progress.

"By a defalcation made from any part of the mass of factitious delay, vexation, and expense, out of which, and in proportion to which, lawyers' profit is made to flow—by any defalcation made from the mass of needless and worse than useless emolument to office, with or without service or pretence of service—by any addition endeavoured to be made to the quantity, or improvement in the quality of service rendered, or time bestowed in service rendered in return for such emolument—by every endeavour that has for its object the persuading the people to place their fate at the disposal of any other agents than those in whose hands breach of trust is certain, due fulfilment of it morally and physically impossible—*social order* is said to be endangered, and threatened to be destroyed."—(p. 234.)

In the same way *Establishment* is a word in use to protect the bad parts of establishments, by charging those who wish to remove or alter them, with a wish to subvert all good establishments.

Mischievous fallacies also circulate from the convertible use of what Mr. B. is pleased to call dyslogistic and eulogistic terms. Thus a vast concern is expressed for the *liberty of the press*, and the utmost abhorrence for its *licentiousness:* but then, by the licentiousness of the press is meant every disclosure by which any abuse is brought to light and exposed to shame—by the *liberty of the press* is meant only publications from which no such inconvenience is to be apprehended; and the fallacy consists in employing the sham approbation of liberty as a mask for the real opposition to all free discussion. To write a pamphlet so ill that nobody will read it; to animadvert in terms so weak and insipid upon great evils, that no disgust is excited at the vice, and no apprehension in the evil doer, is a fair use of the liberty of the press, and is not only pardoned by the friends of government, but draws from them the most fervent eulogium. The licentiousness of the press consists in doing the thing boldly and well, in striking terror into the guilty, and in rousing the attention of the public to the defence of their highest interests. This is the licentiousness of the press held in the greatest horror by timid and corrupt men, and punished by semianimous semicadaverous judges, with a captivity of many years. In the same manner the dyslogistic and eulogistic fallacies are used in the case of reform.

"Between all abuses whatsoever, there exists that connection—between all persons who see each of them, any one abuse in which an advantage results to himself, there exists, in point of interest, that close and sufficiently understood connection, of which intimation has been given already. To no

one abuse can correction be administered without endangering the existence of every other.

"If, then, with this inward determination not to suffer, so far as depends upon himself, the adoption of any reform which he is able to prevent, it should seem to him necessary or advisable to put on for a cover, the profession or appearance of a desire to contribute to such reform—in pursuance of the device or fallacy here in question, he will represent that which goes by the name of reform as distinguishable into two species; one of them a fit subject for approbation, the other for disapprobation. That which he thus professes to have marked for approbation, he will accordingly, for the expression of such approbation, characterise by some adjunct of the *eulogistic* cast, such as moderate, for example, or temperate, or practical, or practicable.

"To the other of these nominally distinct species, he will, at the same time, attach some adjunct of the *dyslogistic* cast, such as violent, intemperate, extravagant, outrageous, theoretical, speculative, and so forth.

"Thus, then, in profession and to appearance, there are in his conception of the matter two distinct and opposite species of reform, to one of which his approbation, to the other his disapprobation, is attached. But the species to which his approbation is attached is an *empty* species—a species in which no individual is, or is intended to be, contained.

"The species to which his disapprobation is attached is, on the contrary, a crowded species, a receptacle in which the whole contents of the *genus*—of the genus *Reform* are intended to be included."—(pp. 277, 278.)

Anti-rational Fallacies.—When reason is in opposition to a man's interests, his study will naturally be to render the faculty itself, and whatever issues from it, an object of hatred and contempt. The sarcasm and other figures of speech employed on the occasion are directed not merely against reason, but against thought, as if there were something in the faculty of thought that rendered the exercise of it incompatible with useful and successful practice. Sometimes a plan, which would not suit the official person's interest, is without more ado pronounced a *speculative* one; and, by this observation, all need of rational and deliberate discussion is considered to be superseded. The first effort of the corruptionist is to fix the epithet *Speculative* upon any scheme which he thinks may cherish the spirit of reform. The expression is hailed with the greatest delight by bad and feeble men, and repeated with the most unwearied energy; and to the word Speculative, by way of reinforcement, are added *theoretical, visionary, chimerical, romantic, Utopian.*

"Sometimes a distinction is taken, and thereupon a concession made. The plan is *good in theory*, but it would be *bad in practice*, i. e. its being good in theory does not hinder its being bad in practice.

"Sometimes, as if in consequence of a farther progress made in the art of irrationality, the plan is pronounced to be *too good to be practicable;* and its being so good as it is, is thus represented as the very cause of its being bad in practice.

"In short, such is the perfection at which this art is at length arrived, that the very circumstance of a plan's being susceptible of the appellation of a *plan*, has been gravely stated as a circumstance sufficient to warrant its being rejected: rejected, if not with hatred, at any rate with a sort of accompaniment, which, to the million, is commonly felt still more galling—with contempt."—(p. 296.)

There is a propensity to push theory too far; but what is the just inference? not that theoretical propositions (*i. e.* all propositions of any considerable comprehension or extent) should, from such their extent, be considered to be false *in toto*, but only that, in the particular case, inquiry should be made whether, supposing the proposition to be in the character of a rule generally true, an exception ought to be taken out of it. It might also be imagined that there was something wicked or unwise in the exercise of thought; for everybody feels a necessity for disclaiming it. "I am not given to speculation, I am no friend to theories." Can a man disclaim theory, can he disclaim speculation, without disclaiming thought?

The description of persons by whom this fallacy is chiefly employed are those who, regarding a plan as adverse to their interests, and not finding it on the ground of general utility exposed to any preponderant objection, have recourse to this objection in the character of an instrument of contempt, in the view of preventing those from

looking into it who might have been otherwise disposed. It is by the fear of seeing it practised that they are drawn to speak of it as impracticable. "Upon the face of it (exclaims some feeble or pensioned gentleman), it carries that air of plausibility, that, if you were not upon your guard, might engage you to bestow more or less of attention upon it; but were you to take the trouble, you would find that (as it is with all these plans which promise so much) practicability would at last be wanting to it. To save yourself from this trouble, the wisest course you can take is to put the plan aside, and to think no more about the matter." This is always accompanied with a peculiar grin of triumph.

The whole of these fallacies may be gathered together in a little oration, which we will denominate the

Noodle's Oration.

"What would our ancestors say to this, Sir? How does this measure tally with their institutions? How does it agree with their experience? Are we to put the wisdom of yesterday in competition with the wisdom of centuries? (*Hear, hear!*) Is beardless youth to show no respect for the decisions of mature age? (*Loud cries of hear! hear!*) If this measure be right, would it have escaped the wisdom of those Saxon progenitors to whom we are indebted for so many of our best political institutions? Would the Dane have passed it over? Would the Norman have rejected it? Would such a notable discovery have been reserved for these modern and degenerate times? Besides, Sir, if the measure itself is good, I ask the honourable gentleman if this is the time for carrying it into execution—whether, in fact, a more unfortunate period could have been selected than that which he has chosen? If this were an ordinary measure, I should not oppose it with so much vehemence; but, Sir, it calls in question the wisdom of an irrevocable law—of a law passed at the memorable period of the Revolution. What right have we, Sir, to break down this firm column, on which the great men of that day stamped a character of eternity? Are not all authorities against this measure—Pitt, Fox, Cicero, and the Attorney and Solicitor General? The proposition is new, Sir; it is the first time it was ever heard in this House. I am not prepared, Sir—this House is not prepared, to receive it. The measure implies a distrust of his Majesty's government; their disapproval is sufficient to warrant opposition. Precaution only is requisite where danger is apprehended. Here the high character of the individuals in question is a sufficient guarantee against any ground of alarm. Give not, then, your sanction to this measure; for, whatever be its character, if you do give your sanction to it, the same man by whom this is proposed, will propose to you others to which it will be impossible to give your consent. I care very little, Sir, for the ostensible measure; but what is there behind? What are the honourable gentleman's future schemes? If we pass this bill, what fresh concessions may he not require? What further degradation is he planning for his country? Talk of evil and inconvenience, Sir! look to other countries—study other aggregations and societies of men, and then see whether the laws of this country demand a remedy or deserve a panegyric. Was the honourable gentleman (let me ask him) always of this way of thinking? Do I not remember when he was the advocate in this House of very opposite opinions? I not only quarrel with his present sentiments, Sir, but I declare very frankly, I do not like the party with which he acts. If his own motives were as pure as possible, they cannot but suffer contamination from those with whom he is politically associated. This measure may be a boon to the constitution; but I will accept no favour to the constitution from such hands. (*Loud cries of hear! hear!*) I profess myself, Sir, an honest and upright member of the British Parliament, and I am not afraid to profess myself an enemy to all change and all innovation. I am satisfied with things as they are; and it will be my pride and pleasure to hand down this coun-

try to my children as I received it from those who preceded me. The honourable gentleman pretends to justify the severity with which he has attacked the noble Lord who presides in the Court of Chancery; but I say such attacks are pregnant with mischief to Government itself. Oppose Ministers, you oppose Government: disgrace Ministers, you disgrace Government: bring Ministers into contempt, you bring Government into contempt; and anarchy and civil war are the consequences. Besides, Sir, the measure is unnecessary. Nobody complains of disorder in that shape in which it is the aim of your measure to propose a remedy to it. The business is one of the greatest importance; there is need of the greatest caution and circumspection. Do not let us be precipitate, Sir. It is impossible to foresee all consequences. Everything should be gradual: the example of a neighbouring nation should fill us with alarm! The honourable gentleman has taxed me with illiberality, Sir. I deny the charge. I hate innovation; but I love improvement. I am an enemy to the corruption of Government; but I defend its influence. I dread Reform; but I dread it only when it is intemperate. I consider the liberty of the Press as the great Palladium of the Constitution; but, at the same time, I hold the licentiousness of the Press in the greatest abhorrence. Nobody is more conscious than I am of the splendid abilities of the honourable mover; but I tell him at once his scheme is too good to be practicable. It savours of Utopia. It looks well in theory; but it won't do in practice. It will not do, I repeat, Sir, in practice; and so the advocates of the measure will find, if unfortunately it should find its way through Parliament. (*Cheers.*) The source of that corruption to which the honourable member alludes, is in the minds of the people: so rank and extensive is that corruption, that no political reform can have any effect in removing it. Instead of reforming others — instead of reforming the State, the Constitution, and everything that is most excellent, let each man reform himself! let him look at home; he will find there enough to do, without looking abroad, and aiming at what is out of his power. (*Loud Cheers.*) And now, Sir, as it is frequently the custom in this House to end with a quotation, and as the gentleman who preceded me in the debate has anticipated me in my favourite quotation of 'The strong pull and the long pull,'— I shall end with the memorable words of the assembled Barons — '*Nolumus leges Angliæ mutari.*'"

"Upon the whole, the following are the characters which appertain in common to all the several arguments here distinguished by the name of fallacies:—

"1. Whatsoever be the measure in hand, they are, with relation to it, irrelevant.

"2. They are all of them such, that the application of these irrelevant arguments affords a presumption either of the weakness or total absence of relevant arguments on the side on which they are employed.

"3. To any good purpose they are all of them unnecessary.

"4. They are all of them not only capable of being applied, but actually in the habit of being applied, and with advantage, to bad purposes; viz. to the obstruction and defeat of all such measures as have for their object the removal of the abuses or other imperfections still discernible in the frame and practice of the government.

"5. By means of their irrelevancy, they all of them consume and misapply time, thereby obstructing the course and retarding the progress of all necessary and useful business.

"6. By that irritative quality which, in virtue of their irrelevancy, with the improbity or weakness of which it is indicative, they possess, all of them, in a degree more or less considerable, but in a more particular degree such of them as consist in personalities, they are productive of ill-humour, which in some instances has been productive of bloodshed, and is continually productive, as above, of waste of time and hindrance of business.

"7. On the part of those who, whether in spoken or written discourses, give utterance to them, they are indicative either of improbity or intellectual weakness, or of a contempt for the understanding of those on whose minds they are destined to operate.

"8. On the part of those on whom they operate, they are indicative of intellectual weakness; and on the part of those in and by whom they are pretended to operate they are indicative of improbity, viz. in the shape of insincerity.

"The practical conclusion is, that in proportion as the acceptance, and thence the utterance, of them can be prevented, the understanding of the public will be strengthened, the morals of the public will be purified, and the practice of government improved."—(pp. 359, 360.)

WATERTON. (E. Review, 1826.)

Wanderings in South America, the North-West of the United States, and the Antilles, in the Years 1812, 1816, 1820, *and* 1824; *with original Instructions for the perfect Preservation of Birds, &c. for Cabinets of Natural History.* By Charles Waterton, Esq. London. Mawman. 4to. 1825.

Mr. Waterton is a Roman Catholic gentleman of Yorkshire, of good fortune, who, instead of passing his life at balls and assemblies, has preferred living with Indians and monkies in the forests of Guiana. He appears in early life to have been seized with an unconquerable aversion to Piccadilly, and to that train of meteorological questions and answers which forms the great staple of polite English conversation. From a dislike to the regular form of a journal, he throws his travels into detached pieces, which he, rather affectedly, calls "Wanderings"—and of which we shall proceed to give some account.

His first Wandering was in the year 1812, through the wilds of Demerara and Essequibo—a part of *cidevant* Dutch Guiana, in South America. The sun exhausted him by day, the mosquitoes bit him by night; but on went Mr. Charles Waterton!

The first thing which strikes us in this extraordinary chronicle, is the genuine zeal and inexhaustible delight with which all the barbarous countries he visits are described. He seems to love the forests, the tigers, and the apes;—to be rejoiced that he is the only man there; that he has left his species far away, and is at last in the midst of his blessed baboons! He writes with a considerable degree of force and vigour; and contrives to infuse into his reader that admiration of the great works and undisturbed scenes of Nature which animates his style, and has influenced his life and practice. There is something, too, to be highly respected and praised in the conduct of a country gentleman, who, instead of exhausting life in the chase, has dedicated a considerable portion of it to the pursuit of knowledge. There are so many temptations to complete idleness in the life of a country gentleman, so many examples of it, and so much loss to the community from it, that every exception from the practice is deserving of great praise. Some country gentlemen must remain to do the business of their counties; but, in general, there are many more than are wanted; and, generally speaking, also, they are a class who should be stimulated to greater exertions. Sir Joseph Banks, a squire of large fortune in Lincolnshire, might have given up his existence to double-barrelled guns and persecution of poachers;—and all the benefits derived from his wealth, industry, and personal exertion in the cause of science, would have been lost to the community.

Mr. Waterton complains that the trees of Guiana are not more than six yards in circumference—a magnitude in trees which it is not easy for a Scotch imagination to reach. Among these, pre-eminent in height rises the mora—upon whose top branches, when naked by age, or dried by accident, is perched the toucan, too high for the gun of the fowler; around this are, the green heart, famous for hardness; the tongh hackea; the ducalabaly, surpassing mahogany; the ebony and letter-wood, exceeding the most beautiful woods of the Old World; the locust-tree, yielding copal; and the hayawa and olou trees, furnishing sweet-smelling resin. Upon the top of the mora grows the fig-tree. The bush-rope joins tree and tree, so as to render the forest impervious, as descending from on high, it takes root as soon as its extremity touches the ground, and appears like shrouds and stays supporting the mainmast of a line-of-battle ship.

Demerara yields to no country in the world in her birds. The mud is flam-

ing with the scarlet curlew. At sunset, the pelicans return from the sea to the courada trees. Among the flowers are the humming-birds. The columbine, gallinaceous, and passerine tribes people the fruit-trees. At the close of the day, the vampires, or winged bats, suck the blood of the traveller, and cool him by the flap of their wings. Nor has Nature forgotten to amuse herself here in the composition of snakes: — the camoudi has been killed from thirty to forty feet long; he does not act by venom, but by size and convolution. The Spaniards affirm that he grows to the length of eighty feet, and that he will swallow a bull; but Spaniards love the superlative. There is a *whipsnake*, of a beautiful green. The Labairi snake, of a dirty brown, who kills you in a few minutes. Every lovely colour under heaven is lavished upon the couna-chouchi, the most venomous of reptiles, and known by the name of the *bush-master*. Man and beast, says Mr. Waterton, fly before him, and allow him to pursue an undisputed path.

We consider the following description of the various sounds in these wild regions, as very striking, and done with very considerable powers of style.

"He whose eye can distinguish the various beauties of uncultivated nature, and whose ear is not shut to the wild sounds in the woods, will be delighted in passing up the river Demerara. Every now and then, the maam or tinamou sends forth one long and plaintive whistle from the depth of the forest, and then stops; whilst the yelping of the toucan, and the shrill voice of the bird called pi-pi-yo, is heard during the interval. The campanero never fails to attract the attention of the passenger: at a distance of nearly three miles you may hear this snow-white bird tolling every four or five minutes, like the distant convent bell. From six to nine in the morning, the forests resound with the mingled cries and strains of the feathered race; after this they gradually die away. From eleven to three all nature is hushed as in a midnight silence, and scarce a note is heard, saving that of the campanero and the pi-pi-yo; it is then that, oppressed by the solar heat, the birds retire to the thickest shade, and wait for the refreshing cool of evening.

"At sundown the vampires, bats, and goatsuckers, dart from their lonely retreat, and skim along the trees on the river's bank. The different kinds of frogs almost stun the ear with their hoarse and hollow sounding croaking, while the owls and goatsuckers lament and mourn all night long.

"About two hours before daybreak you will hear the red monkey moaning as though in deep distress; the houtou, a solitary bird, and only found in the thickest recesses of the forest, distinctly articulates, 'houtou, houtou,' in a low and plaintive tone, an hour before sunrise; the maam whistles about the same hour; the hannaquoi, pataca, and maroudi announce his near approach to the eastern horizon, and the parrots and paroquets confirm his arrival there."—(pp. 13—15.)

Our good Quixote of Demerara is a little too fond of apostrophising: — "Traveller! dost thou think? Reader! dost thou imagine?" Mr. Waterton should remember, that the whole merit of these violent deviations from common style depends upon their rarity; and that nothing does, for ten pages together, but the indicative mood. This fault gives an air of affectation to the writing of Mr. Waterton, which we believe to be foreign from his character and nature. We do not wish to deprive him of these indulgences altogether; but merely to put him upon an allowance, and upon such an allowance as will give to these figures of speech the advantage of surprise and relief.

This gentleman's delight and exultation always appear to increase as he loses sight of European inventions, and comes to something purely Indian. Speaking of an Indian tribe, he says,—

"They had only one gun, and it appeared rusty and neglected; but their poisoned weapons were in fine order. Their blowpipes hung from the roof of the hut, carefully suspended by a silk grass cord; and on taking a nearer view of them, no dust seemed to have collected there, nor had the spider spun the smallest web on them; which showed that they were in constant use. The quivers were close by them, with the jaw-bone of the fish pirai tied by a string to their brim, and a small wicker-basket of wild cotton, which hung down to the centre: they were nearly full of poisoned arrows. It was with difficulty these Indians could be persuaded to part with any of the Wourali poison, though a good price was offered for it: they gave us to understand

that it was powder and shot to them, and very difficult to be procured."—(pp. 34, 35.)

A wicker-basket of wild cotton, full of poisoned arrows for shooting fish! This is Indian with a vengeance. We fairly admit, that in the contemplation of such utensils, every trait of civilised life is completely and effectually banished.

One of the strange and fanciful objects of Mr. Waterton's journey was, to obtain a better knowledge of the composition and nature of the *Wourali* poison, the ingredient with which the Indians poison their arrows. In the wilds of Essequibo, far away from any European settlements, there is a tribe of Indians, known by the name of *Macoushi*. The *Wourali* poison is used by all the South American savages betwixt the Amazon and the Oroonoque; but the Macoushi Indians manufacture it with the greatest skill, and of the greatest strength. A vine grows in the forest, called Wourali; and from this vine, together with a good deal of nonsense and absurdity, the poison is prepared. When a native of Macoushi goes in quest of feathered game, he seldom carries his bow and arrows. It is the blow-pipe he then uses. The reed grows to an amazing length, as the part the Indians use is from 10 to 11 feet long, and no tapering can be perceived, one end being as thick as another; nor is there the slightest appearance of a knot or joint. The end which is applied to the mouth is tied round with a small silk grass cord. The arrow is from 9 to 10 inches long; it is made out of the leaf of a palm-tree, and pointed as sharp as a needle: about an inch of the pointed end is poisoned; the other end is burnt to make it still harder; and wild cotton is put round it for an inch and a half. The quiver holds from 500 to 600 arrows, is from 12 to 14 inches long, and in shape like a dice-box. With a quiver of these poisoned arrows over his shoulder, and his blow-pipe in his hand, the Indian stalks into the forest in quest of his feathered game.

"These generally sit high up in the tall and tufted trees, but still are not out of the Indian's reach; for his blow-pipe, at its greatest elevation, will send an arrow three hundred feet. Silent as midnight he steals under them, and so cautiously does he tread the ground, that the fallen leaves rustle not beneath his feet. His ears are open to the least sound, while his eye, keen as that of the lynx, is employed in finding out the game in the thickest shade. Often he imitates their cry, and decoys them from tree to tree, till they are within range of his tube. Then, taking a poisoned arrow from his quiver, he puts it in the blow-pipe, and collects his breath for the fatal puff.

"About two feet from the end through which he blows, there are fastened two teeth of the acouri, and these serve him for a sight. Silent and swift the arrow flies, and seldom fails to pierce the object at which it is sent. Sometimes the wounded bird remains in the same tree where it was shot, but in three minutes falls down at the Indian's feet. Should he take wing, his flight is of short duration, and the Indian, following in the direction he has gone, is sure to find him dead.

"It is natural to imagine that, when a slight wound only is inflicted, the game will make its escape. Far otherwise: the Wourali poison instantaneously mixes with blood or water, so that if you wet your finger, and dash it along the poisoned arrow in the quickest manner possible, you are sure to carry off some of the poison.

"Though three minutes generally elapse before the convulsions come on in the wounded bird, still a stupor evidently takes place sooner, and this stupor manifests itself by an apparent unwillingness in the bird to move. This was very visible in a dying fowl."—(pp. 60—62.)

The flesh of the game is not in the slightest degree injured by the poison; nor does it appear to be corrupted sooner than that killed by the gun or knife. For the larger animals, an arrow with a poisoned spike is used.

"Thus armed with deadly poison, and hungry as the hyæna, he ranges through the forest in quest of the wild beasts' track. No hound can act a surer part. Without clothes to fetter him, or shoes to bind his feet, he observes the footsteps of the game, where an European eye could not discern the smallest vestige. He pursues it through all its turns and windings, with astonishing perseverance, and success generally crowns his efforts. The animal, after receiving the poisoned arrow, seldom retreats two hundred paces before it drops.

"In passing over land from the Essequibo to the Demerara, we fell in with a herd of

wild hogs. Though encumbered with baggage, and fatigued with a hard day's walk, an Indian got his bow ready, and let fly a poisoned arrow at one of them. It entered the cheek-bone, and broke off. The wild hog was found quite dead about one hundred and seventy paces from the place where he had been shot. He afforded us an excellent and wholesome supper."—(p. 65.)

Being a *Wourali* poison fancier, Mr. Waterton has recorded several instances of the power of his favourite drug. A sloth poisoned by it went gently to sleep, and died! a large ox, weighing one thousand pounds, was shot with three arrows; the poison took effect in 4 minutes, and in 25 minutes he was dead. The death seems to be very gentle, and resembles more a quiet apoplexy, brought on by hearing a long story, than any other kind of death. If an Indian happen to be wounded with one of these arrows, he considers it as certain death. We have reason to congratulate ourselves that our method of terminating disputes is by sword and pistol, and not by these medicated pins; which, we presume, will become the weapons of gentlemen in the New Republics of South America.

The *second* Journey of Mr. Waterton, in the year 1816, was to Pernambuco, in the southern hemisphere, on the coast of Brazil; and from thence he proceeds to Cayenne. His plan was, to have ascended the Amazon from Para, and got into the Rio Negro, and from thence to have returned towards the source of the Essequibo, in order to examine the Crystal Mountains, and to look once more for Lake Parima, or the White Sea; but on arriving at Cayenne, he found that to beat up the Amazon would be long and tedious: he left Cayenne, therefore, in an American ship for Paramaribo, went through the interior to Coryntin, stopped a few days at New Amsterdam, and proceeded to Demerara.

"Leave behind you (he says to the traveller) your high-seasoned dishes, your wines, and your delicacies; carry nothing but what is necessary for your own comfort, and the object in view, and depend upon the skill of an Indian, or your own, for fish and game. A sheet, about twelve feet long, ten wide, painted, and with loop-holes on each side, will be of great service: in a few minutes you can suspend it betwixt two trees in the shape of a roof. Under this, in your hammock, you may defy the pelting shower, and sleep heedless of the dews of night. A hat, a shirt, and a light pair of trowsers, will be all the raiment you require. Custom will soon teach you to tread lightly and barefoot on the little inequalities of the ground, and show you how to pass on, unwounded, amid the mantling briars."—(pp. 112, 113.)

Snakes are certainly an annoyance; but the snake, though high spirited, is not quarrelsome; he considers his fangs to be given for defence, and not for annoyance, and never inflicts a wound but to defend existence. If you tread upon him, he puts you to death for your clumsiness, merely because he does not understand what your clumsiness means; and certainly a snake, who feels fourteen or fifteen stone stamping upon his tail, has little time for reflection, and may be allowed to be poisonous and peevish. American tigers generally run away—from which several respectable gentlemen in Parliament inferred, in the American war, that American soldiers would run away also!

The description of the birds is very animated and interesting; but how far does the gentle reader imagine the campanero may be heard, whose size is that of a jay? Perhaps 300 yards. Poor innocent, ignorant reader! unconscious of what Nature has done in the forests of Cayenne, and measuring the force of tropical intonation by the sounds of a Scotch duck! The campanero may be heard three miles!—this single little bird being more powerful than the belfry of a cathedral, ringing for a new dean—just appointed on account of shabby politics, small understanding, and good family!

"The fifth species is the celebrated campanero of the Spaniards, called dara by the Indians, and bell-bird by the English. He is about the size of the jay. His plumage is white as snow. On his forehead rises a spiral tube nearly three inches long. It is jet black, dotted all over with small white feathers. It has a communication with the

palate, and when filled with air, looks like a spire; when empty it becomes pendulous. His note is loud and clear, like the sound of a bell, and may be heard at the distance of three miles. In the midst of these extensive wilds, generally on the dried top of an aged mora, almost out of gun reach, you will see the campanero. No sound or song from any of the winged inhabitants of the forest, not even the clearly pronounced 'Whip-poor-Will,' from the goatsucker, cause such astonishment as the toll of the campanero.

"With many of the feathered race he pays the common tribute of a morning and an evening song; and even when the meridian sun has shut in silence the mouths of almost the whole of animated nature, the campanero still cheers the forest. You hear his toll, and then a pause for a minute, then another toll, and then a pause again, and then a toll, and again a pause."—(pp. 117, 118.)

It is impossible to contradict a gentleman who has been in the forests of Cayenne; but we are determined, as soon as a campanero is brought to England, to make him toll in a public place, and have the distance measured. The toucan has an enormous bill, makes a noise like a puppy dog, and lays his eggs in hollow trees? How astonishing are the freaks and fancies of Nature! To what purpose, we say, is a bird placed in the woods of Cayenne, with a bill a yard long, making a noise like a puppy dog, and laying eggs in hollow trees? The toucans, to be sure, might retort, to what purpose were gentlemen in Bond street created? To what purpose were certain foolish prating Members of Parliament created?—pestering the House of Commons with their ignorance and folly, and impeding the business of the country? There is no end of such questions. So we will not enter into the metaphysics of the toucan. The houtou ranks high in beauty; his whole body is green, his wings and tail blue, his crown is of black and blue; he makes no nest, but rears his young in the sand.

"The cassique, in size, is larger than the starling; he courts the society of man, but disdains to live by his labours. When Nature calls for support, he repairs to the neighbouring forest, and there partakes of the store of fruits and seeds, which she has produced in abundance for her aërial tribes. When his repast is over, he returns to man, and pays the little tribute which he owes him for his protection; he takes his station on a tree, close to his house; and there, for hours together, pours forth a succession of imitative notes. His own song is sweet, but very short. If a toucan be yelping in the neighbourhood, he drops it, and imitates him. Then he will amuse his protector with the cries of the different species of the woodpecker; and when the sheep bleat, he will distinctly answer them. Then comes his own song again, and if a puppy dog or a guinea fowl interrupt him, he takes them off admirably, and by his different gestures during the time, you would conclude that he enjoys the sport.

"The cassique is gregarious, and imitates any sound he hears with such exactness, that he goes by no other name than that of mocking-bird amongst the colonists."—(pp. 127, 128.)

There is no end to the extraordinary noises of the forest of Cayenne. The woodpecker, in striking against the tree with his bill, makes a sound so loud, that Mr. Waterton says it reminds you more of a wood-cutter than a bird. While lying in your hammock, you hear the goatsucker lamenting like one in deep distress—a stranger would take it for a Weir murdered by Thurtell.

"Suppose yourself in hopeless sorrow, begin with a high loud note, and pronounce, 'ha, ha, ha, ha, ha, ha, ha,' each note lower and lower, till the last is scarcely heard, pausing a moment or two betwixt every note, and you will have some idea of the moaning of the largest goatsucker in Demerara."—(p. 141.)

One species of the goatsucker cries, "Who are you? who are you?" Another exclaims, "Work away, work away." A third, "Willy, come go, Willy, come go." A fourth, "Whip-poor-Will, Whip-poor-Will." It is very flattering to us that they should all speak *English!*—though we cannot much commend the elegance of their selections. The Indians never destroy these birds, believing them to be the servants of Jumbo, the African devil.

Great travellers are very fond of triumphing over civilised life; and Mr. Waterton does not omit the opportunity of remarking, that nobody ever

stopt him in the forests of Cayenne to ask him for his licence, or to inquire if he had a hundred a year, or to take away his gun, or to dispute the limits of a manor, or to threaten him with a tropical justice of the peace. We hope, however, that in this point we are on the eve of improvement. Mr. Peel, who is a man of high character and principles, may depend upon it that the time is come for his interference, and that it will be a loss of reputation to him not to interfere. If any one else can and will carry an alteration through Parliament, there is no occasion that the hand of Government should appear; but some hand *must* appear. The common people are becoming ferocious, and the perdricide criminals are more numerous than the violators of all the branches of the Decalogue.

"The king of the vultures is very handsome, and seems to be the only bird which claims regal honours from a surrounding tribe. It is a fact beyond all dispute, that when the scent of carrion has drawn together hundreds of the common vultures, they all retire from the carcass as soon as the king of the vultures makes his appearance. When his majesty has satisfied the cravings of his royal stomach with the choicest bits from the most stinking and corrupted parts, he generally retires to a neighbouring tree, and then the common vultures return in crowds to gobble down his leavings. The Indians, as well as the whites, have observed this; for when one of them, who has learned a little English, sees the king, and wishes you to have a proper notion of the bird, he says, 'There is the governor of the carrion crows.'

"Now, the Indians have never heard of a personage in Demerara higher than that of governor; and the colonists, through a common mistake, call the vultures carrion crows. Hence the Indian, in order to express the dominion of this bird over the common vultures, tells you he is governor of the carrion crows. The Spaniards have also observed it, for through all the Spanish Main he is called Rey de Zamuros, king of the vultures."—(p. 146.)

This, we think, explains satisfactorily the origin of kingly government. As men have "learnt from the dog the physic of the field," they may probably have learnt from the vulture those high lessons of policy upon which, in Europe, we suppose the whole happiness of society, and the very existence of the human race, to depend.

Just before his third journey, Mr. Waterton takes leave of Sir Joseph Banks, and speaks of him with affectionate regret. "I saw," (says Mr. W.) "with sorrow, that death was going to rob us of him. We talked of stuffing quadrupeds; I agreed that the lips and nose ought to be cut off, and stuffed with wax." This is the way great naturalists take an eternal farewell of each other! Upon stuffing animals, however, we have a word to say. Mr. Waterton has placed at the head of his book, the picture of what he is pleased to consider a nondescript species of monkey. In this exhibition our author is surely abusing his stuffing talents, and laughing at the public. It is clearly the head of a Master in Chancery—whom we have often seen backing in the House of Commons after he has delivered his message. It is foolish thus to trifle with science and natural history. Mr. Waterton gives an interesting account of the sloth, an animal of which he appears to be fond, and whose habits he has studied with peculiar attention.

"Some years ago I kept a sloth in my room for several months. I often took him out of the house and placed him upon the ground, in order to have an opportunity of observing his motions. If the ground were rough, he would pull himself forwards by means of his fore legs, at a pretty good pace; and he invariably shaped his course towards the nearest tree. But if I put him upon a smooth and well-trodden part of the road, he appeared to be in trouble and distress: his favourite abode was the back of a chair; and after getting all his legs in a line upon the topmost part of it, he would hang there for hours together, and often, with a low and inward cry, would seem to invite me to take notice of him."—(p. 164.)

The sloth, in its wild state, spends its life in trees, and never leaves them but from force or accident. The eagle to the sky, the mole to the ground, the sloth to the tree; but what is most extraordinary, he lives not *upon* the branches, but *under* them. He moves suspended, rests suspended, sleeps sus-

pended, and passes his life in suspense—like a young clergyman distantly related to a bishop. Strings of ants may be observed, says our good traveller, a mile long, each carrying in its mouth a green leaf the size of a sixpence! he does not say whether this is a loyal procession, like Oak-apple Day, or for what purpose these leaves are carried; but it appears, while they are carrying the leaves, the three sorts of ant-bears are busy in eating them. The habits of the largest of these three animals are curious, and to us new. We recommend the account to the attention of the reader.

"He is chiefly found in the inmost recesses of the forest, and seems partial to the low and swampy parts near creeks where the Trocly tree grows. There he goes up and down in quest of ants, of which there is never the least scarcity; so that he soon obtains a sufficient supply of food, with very little trouble. He cannot travel fast; man is superior to him in speed. Without swiftness to enable him to escape from his enemies, without teeth, the possession of which would assist him in self-defence, and without the power of burrowing in the ground, by which he might conceal himself from his pursuers, he still is capable of ranging through these wilds in perfect safety; nor does he fear the fatal pressure of the serpent's fold, or the teeth of the famished jaguar. Nature has formed his fore legs wonderfully thick, and strong, and muscular, and armed his feet with three tremendous sharp and crooked claws. Whenever he seizes an animal with these formidable weapons, he hugs it close to his body, and keeps it there till it dies through pressure, or through want of food. Nor does the ant-bear, in the meantime, suffer much from loss of aliment, as it is a well-known fact that he can go longer without food than perhaps any other animal, except the land tortoise. His skin is of a texture that perfectly resists the bite of a dog; his hinder parts are protected by thick and shaggy hair, while his immense tail is large enough to cover his whole body.

"The Indians have a great dread of coming in contact with the ant-bear; and after disabling him in the chase, never think of approaching him till he be quite dead."—(pp. 171, 172.)

The vampire measures about 26 inches from wing to wing. There are two species, large and small. The large suck men, and the smaller birds. Mr. W. saw some fowls which had been sucked the night before, and they were scarcely able to walk.

"Some years ago I went to the river Paumaron with a Scotch gentleman, by name Tarbet. We hung our hammocks in the thatched loft of a planter's house. Next morning I heard this gentleman muttering in his hammock, and now and then letting fall an imprecation or two, just about the time he ought to have been saying his morning prayers. 'What is the matter, Sir?' said I, softly; 'is anything amiss?'—'What's the matter?' answered he, surlily; 'why the vampires have been sucking me to death.' As soon as there was light enough, I went to his hammock, and saw it much stained with blood. 'There,' said he, thrusting his foot out of the hammock, 'see how these infernal imps have been drawing my life's blood.' On examining his foot, I found the vampire had tapped his great toe: there was a wound somewhat less than that made by a leech; the blood was still oozing from it; I conjectured he might have lost from ten to twelve ounces of blood. Whilst examining it, I think I put him into a worse humour by remarking that an European surgeon would not have been so generous as to have blooded him without making a charge. He looked up in my face, but did not say a word: I saw he was of opinion that I had better have spared this piece of ill-timed levity."—(pp. 176, 177.)

The story which follows this account is vulgar, unworthy of Mr. Waterton, and should have been omitted.

Every animal has his enemies. The land tortoise has two enemies—man, and the boa constrictor. The natural defence of the tortoise is to draw himself up in his shell, and to remain quiet. In this state, the tiger, however famished, can do nothing with him, for the shell is too strong for the stroke of his paw. Man, however, takes him home and roasts him—and the boa constrictor swallows him whole, shell and all, and consumes him slowly in the interior, as the Court of Chancery does a great estate.

The danger seems to be much less with snakes and wild beasts, if you conduct yourself like a gentleman, and are not abruptly intrusive. If you will pass on gently, you may walk unhurt within a yard of the Labairi snake,

who would put you to death if you rushed upon him. The taguan knocks you down with a blow of his paw, if suddenly interrupted, but will run away, if you will give him time to do so. In short, most animals look upon man as a very ugly customer; and, unless sorely pressed for food, or from fear of their own safety, are not fond of attacking him. Mr. Waterton, though much given to sentiment, made a Labairi snake bite itself, but no bad consequences ensued —nor would any bad consequences ensue, if a court-martial were to order a sinful soldier to give himself a thousand lashes. It is barely possible that the snake had some faint idea whom and what he was biting.

Insects are the curse of tropical climates. The bête rouge lays the foundation of a tremendous ulcer. In a moment you are covered with ticks. Chigoes bury themselves in your flesh, and hatch a large colony of young chigoes in a few hours. They will not live together, but every chigoe sets up a separate ulcer, and has his own private portion of pus. Flies get entry into your mouth, into your eyes, into your nose; you eat flies, drink flies, and breathe flies. Lizards, cockroaches, and snakes, get into the bed; ants eat up the books; scorpions sting you on the foot. Everything bites, stings, or bruises; every second of your existence you are wounded by some piece of animal life that nobody has ever seen before, except Swammerdam and Meriam. An insect with eleven legs is swimming in your teacup, a nondescript with nine wings is struggling in the small beer, or a caterpillar with several dozen eyes in his belly is hastening over the bread and butter! All nature is alive, and seems to be gathering all her entomological hosts to eat you up, as you are standing, out of your coat, waistcoat, and breeches. Such are the tropics. All this reconciles us to our dews, fogs, vapours, and drizzle—to our apothecaries rushing about with gargles and tinctures—to our old, British, constitutional coughs, sore throats, and swelled faces.

We come now to the counterpart of St. George and the Dragon. Every one knows that the large snake of tropical climates throws himself upon his prey, twists the folds of his body round the victim, presses him to death, and then eats him. Mr. Waterton wanted a large snake for the sake of his skin; and it occurred to him, that the success of this sort of combat depended upon who began first, and that if he could contrive to fling himself upon the snake, he was just as likely to send the snake to the British Museum, as the snake, if allowed the advantage of prior occupation, was to eat him up. The opportunities which Yorkshire squires have of combating with the boa constrictor are so few, that Mr. Waterton must be allowed to tell his own story in his own manner.

"We went slowly on in silence, without moving our arms or heads, in order to prevent all alarm as much as possible, lest the snake should glide off, or attack us in self-defence. I carried the lance perpendicularly before me, with the point about a foot from the ground. The snake had not moved; and on getting up to him, I struck him with the lance on the near side, just behind the neck, and pinned him to the ground. That moment the negro next to me seized the lance and held it firm in its place, while I dashed head foremost into the den to grapple with the snake, and to get hold of his tail before he could do any mischief.

"On pinning him to the ground with the lance, he gave a tremendous loud hiss, and the little dog ran away, howling as he went. We had a sharp fray in the den, the rotten sticks flying on all sides, and each party struggling for superiority. I called out to the second negro to throw himself upon me, as I found I was not heavy enough. He did so, and the additional weight was of great service. I had now got firm hold of his tail; and after a violent struggle or two, he gave in, finding himself overpowered. This was the moment to secure him. So, while the first negro continued to hold the lance firm to the ground, and the other was helping me, I contrived to unloose my braces, and with them tied up the snake's mouth.

"The snake, now finding himself in an unpleasant situation, tried to better himself, and set resolutely to work, but we overpowered him. We contrived to make him twist himself round the shaft of the lance, and then prepared to convey him out of the forest. I stood at his head, and held it firm under my arm, one negro supported

the belly, and the other the tail. In this order we began to move slowly towards home, and reached it after resting ten times; for the snake was too heavy for us to support him without stopping to recruit our strength. As we proceeded onwards with him, he fought hard for freedom, but it was all in vain."—(pp. 202—204.)

One of these combats we should have thought sufficient for glory, and for the interests of the British Museum. But Hercules killed two snakes, and Mr. Waterton would not be content with less.

"There was a path where timber had formerly been dragged along. Here I observed a young coulacanara, ten feet long, slowly moving onwards; I saw he was not thick enough to break my arm, in case he got twisted round it. There was not a moment to be lost. I laid hold of his tail with the left hand, one knee being on the ground; with the right I took off my hat, and held it as you would hold a shield for defence.

"The snake instantly turned, and came on at me, with his head about a yard from the ground, as if to ask me what business I had to take liberties with his tail. I let him come, hissing and open-mouthed, within two feet of my face, and then, with all the force I was master of, I drove my fist, shielded by my hat, full in his jaws. He was stunned and confounded by the blow, and ere he could recover himself, I had seized his throat with both hands, in such a position that he could not bite me; I then allowed him to coil himself round my body, and marched off with him as my lawful prize. He pressed me hard, but not alarmingly so."—(pp. 206, 207.)

When the body of the large snake began to smell, the vultures immediately arrived. The king of the vultures first gorged himself, and then retired to a large tree while his subjects consumed the remainder. It does not appear that there was any favouritism. When the king was full, all the mob vultures ate alike; neither could Mr. Waterton perceive that there was any division into Catholic and Protestant vultures, or that the majority of the flock thought it essentially vulturish to exclude one third of their numbers from the blood and entrails. The vulture, it is remarkable, never eats live animals. He seems to abhor everything which has not the relish of putrescence and flavour of death. The following is a characteristic specimen of the little inconveniences to which travellers are liable, who sleep on the feather-beds of the forest. To see a rat in a room in Europe insures a night of horror. Everything is by comparison.

"About midnight, as I was lying awake, and in great pain, I heard the Indians say, 'Massa, massa, you no hear tiger?' I listened attentively, and heard the softly sounding tread of his feet as he approached us. The moon had gone down; but every now and then we could get a glance of him by the light of our fire: he was the jaguar, for I could see the spots on his body. Had I wished to have fired at him, I was not able to take a sure aim, for I was in such pain that I could not turn myself in my hammock. The Indian would have fired, but I would not allow him to do so, as I wanted to see a little more of our new visitor; for it is not every day or night that the traveller is favoured with an undisturbed sight of the jaguar in his own forest.

"Whenever the fire got low, the jaguar came a little nearer, and when the Indian renewed it, he retired abruptly; sometimes he would come within twenty yards, and then we had a view of him, sitting on his hind legs like a dog; sometimes he moved slowly to and fro, and at other times we could hear him mend his pace, as if impatient. At last the Indian, not relishing the idea of having such company in the neighbourhood, could contain himself no longer, and set up a most tremendous yell. The jaguar bounded off like a race-horse, and returned no more; it appeared by the print of his feet the next morning, that he was a full-grown jaguar."—(pp. 212, 213.)

We have seen Mr. Waterton fling himself upon a snake; we shall now mount him upon a crocodile, undertaking that this shall be the last of his feats exhibited to the reader. He had baited for a cayman or crocodile, the hook was swallowed, and the object was to pull the animal up and to secure him. "If you pull him up," say the Indians, "as soon as he sees you on the brink of the river, he will run at you and destroy you." "Never mind," says our traveller, "pull away, and leave the rest to me." And accordingly he places himself upon the shore, with the mast of the canoe in his hand,

ready to force it down the throat of the crocodile, as soon as he makes his appearance.

"By the time the cayman was within two yards of me, I saw he was in a state of fear and perturbation; I instantly dropped the mast, sprung up, and jumped on his back, turning half round as I vaulted, so that I gained my seat with my face in a right position. I immediately seized his fore legs, and, by main force, twisted them on his back; thus they served me for a bridle.

"He now seemed to have recovered from his surprise, and probably fancying himself in hostile company, he began to plunge furiously, and lashed the sand with his long and powerful tail. I was out of reach of the strokes of it, by being near his head. He continued to plunge and strike, and made my seat very uncomfortable. It must have been a fine sight for an unoccupied spectator.

"The people roared out in triumph, and were so vociferous, that it was some time before they heard me tell them to pull me and my beast of burden farther in land. I was apprehensive the rope might break, and then there would have been every chance of going down to the regions under water with the cayman. That would have been more perilous than Arion's marine morning ride:—

'Delphini insidens, vada cærula sulcat
Arion.'

"The people now dragged us above forty yards on the sand: it was the first and last time I was ever on a cayman's back. Should it be asked, how I managed to keep my seat, I would answer—I hunted some years with Lord Darlington's foxhounds."—(pp. 231, 232.)

The Yorkshire gentlemen have long been famous for their equestrian skill; but Mr. Waterton is the first among them of whom it could be said that he has a fine hand upon a crocodile. This accursed animal, so ridden by Mr. Waterton, is the scourge and terror of all the large rivers in South America near the Line. Their boldness is such, that a cayman has sometimes come out of the Oroonoque, at Angustura, near the public walks where the people were assembled, seized a full-grown man, as big as Sir William Curtis after dinner, and hurried him into the bed of the river for his food. The governor of Angustura witnessed this circumstance himself.

Our Eboracic traveller had now been nearly eleven months in the desert, and not in vain. Shall we express our doubts, or shall we confidently state at once the immense wealth he had acquired?—a prodigious variety of insects, two hundred and thirty birds, ten land-tortoises, five armadillas, two large serpents, a sloth, an ant-bear, and a cayman. At Liverpool, the Custom-house officers, men ignorant of Linnæus, got hold of his collection, detained it six weeks, and, in spite of remonstrances to the Treasury, he was forced to pay very high duties. This is really perfectly absurd; that a man of science cannot bring a pickled armadilla, for a collection of natural history, without paying a tax for it. This surely must have happened in the dark days of Nicolas. We cannot doubt but that such paltry exactions have been swept away by the manly and liberal policy of Robinson and Huskisson. That a great people should compel an individual to make them a payment before he can be permitted to land a stuffed snake upon their shores, is, of all the paltry Custom-house robberies we ever heard of, the most mean and contemptible—but *Major rerum, ordo nascitur.*

The *fourth* journey of Mr. Waterton is to the United States. It is pleasantly written; but our author does not appear as much at home among men as among beasts. Shooting, stuffing, and pursuing are his occupations. He is lost in places where there are no bushes, snakes, nor Indians—but he is full of good and amiable feeling wherever he goes. We cannot avoid introducing the following passage:—

"The steam-boat from Quebec to Montreal had above five hundred Irish emigrants on board. They were going 'they hardly knew whither,' far away from dear Ireland. It made one's heart ache to see them all huddled together, without any expectation of ever revisiting their native soil. We feared that the sorrow of leaving home for ever, the miserable accommodations on board the ship which had brought them away, and the tossing of the angry ocean, in a long and dreary voyage, would have rendered them callous to good behaviour. But it was quite otherwise. They conducted

themselves with great propriety. Every American on board seemed to feel for them. And then, 'they were so full of wretchedness. Need and oppression stared within their eyes. Upon their backs hung ragged misery. The world was not their friend.' 'Poor dear Ireland,' exclaimed an aged female, as I was talking to her, 'I shall never see it any more!'"—(pp. 259, 260.)

And thus it is in every region of the earth! There is no country where an Englishman can set his foot, that he does not meet these miserable victims of English cruelty and oppression — banished from their country by the stupidity, bigotry, and meanness of the English people, who trample on their liberty and conscience, because each man is afraid, in another reign, of being out of favour, and losing his share in the spoil.

We are always glad to see America praised (slavery excepted). And yet there is still, we fear, a party in this country, who are glad to pay their court to the timid and the feeble, by sneering at this great spectacle of human happiness. We never think of it without considering it as a great lesson to the people of England, to look into their own affairs, to watch and suspect their rulers, and not to be defrauded of happiness and money by pompous names, and false pretences.

"Our western brother is in possession of a country replete with everything that can contribute to the happiness and comfort of mankind. His code of laws, purified by experience and common sense, has fully answered the expectations of the public. By acting up to the true spirit of this code, he has reaped immense advantages from it. His advancement, as a nation, has been rapid beyond all calculation; and, young as he is, it may be remarked, without any impropriety, that he is now actually reading a salutary lesson to the rest of the civilised world."—(p. 273.)

Now, what shall we say, after all, of Mr. Waterton? That he has spent a great part of his life in wandering in the wild scenes he describes, and that he describes them with entertaining zeal and real feeling. His stories draw largely sometimes on our faith; but a man who lives in the woods of Cayenne must do many odd things, and see many odd things — things utterly unknown to the dwellers in Hackney and Highgate. We do not want to rein up Mr. Waterton too tightly — because we are convinced he goes best with his head free. But a little less of apostrophe, and some faint suspicion of his own powers of humour, would improve this gentleman's style. As it is, he has a considerable talent at describing. He abounds with good feeling; and has written a very entertaining book, which hurries the reader out of his European parlour, into the heart of tropical forests, and gives, over the rules and the cultivation of the civilised parts of the earth, a momentary superiority to the freedom of the savage, and the wild beauties of Nature. We honestly recommend the book to our readers: it is well worth the perusal.

GRANBY. (E. Review, 1826.)

Granby. A Novel in Three Volumes. London. Colburn. 1826.

There is nothing more amusing in the spectacles of the present day, than to see the Sir John's and Sir Thomas's of the House of Commons struck aghast by the useful science and wise novelties of Mr. Huskisson and the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Treason, Disaffection, Atheism, Republicanism, and Socinianism — the great guns in the Noodle's park of artillery — they cannot bring to bear upon these gentlemen. Even to charge with a regiment of ancestors is not quite so efficacious as it used to be; and all that remains, therefore, is to rail against Peter M'Culloch and Political Economy! In the meantime, day after day, down goes one piece of nonsense or another. The most approved trash, and the most trusty clamours, are found to be utterly powerless. Twopenny taunts and trumpery truisms have lost their destructive omnipotence; and the exhausted common-placemen, and the afflicted fool, moan over the ashes of Imbecility, and strew flowers on the

urn of Ignorance! General Elliot found the London tailors in a state of mutiny, and he raised from them a regiment of light cavalry, which distinguished itself in a very striking manner at the battle of Minden. In humble imitation of this example, we shall avail ourselves of the present political disaffection and unsatisfactory idleness of many men of rank and consequence, to request their attention to the Novel of Granby — written, as we have heard, by a young gentleman of the name of Lister*, and from which we have derived a considerable deal of pleasure and entertainment.

The main question as to a novel is — did it amuse? were you surprised at dinner coming so soon? did you mistake eleven for ten, and twelve for eleven? were you too late to dress? and did you sit up beyond the usual hour? If a novel produces these effects, it is good; if it does not — story, language, love, scandal itself cannot save it. It is only meant to please; and it must do that, or it does nothing. Now Granby seems to us to answer this test extremely well; it produces unpunctuality, makes the reader too late for dinner, impatient of contradiction, and inattentive, — even if a bishop is making an observation, or a gentleman, lately from the Pyramids, or the Upper Cataracts, is let loose upon the drawing-room. The objection, indeed, to these compositions, when they are well done, is, that it is impossible to do anything, or perform any human duty, while we are engaged in them. Who can read Mr. Hallam's Middle Ages, or extract the root of an impossible quantity, or draw up a bond, when he is in the middle of Mr. Trebeck and Lady Charlotte Duncan? How can the boy's lesson be heard, about the Jove-nourished Achilles, or his six miserable verses upon Dido be corrected, when Henry Granby and Mr. Courtenay are both making love to Miss Jermyn? Common life palls in the middle of these artificial scenes. All is emotion when the book is open —all dull, flat, and feeble when it is shut.

Granby, a young man of no profession, living with an old uncle in the country, falls in love with Miss Jermyn, and Miss Jermyn with him; but Sir Thomas and Lady Jermyn, as the young gentleman is not rich, having discovered, by long living in the world and patient observation of its ways, that young people are commonly Malthus-proof and have children, and that young and old must eat, very naturally do what they can to discourage the union. The young people, however, both go to town — meet at balls — flutter, blush, look and cannot speak — speak and cannot look, — suspect, misinterpret, are sad and mad, peevish and jealous, fond and foolish; but the passion, after all, seems less near to its accomplishment at the end of the season than the beginning. The uncle of Granby, however, dies, and leaves to his nephew a statement accompanied with the requisite proofs — that Mr. Tyrrel, the supposed son of Lord Malton, is illegitimate, and that he, Granby, is the heir to Lord Malton's fortune. The second volume is now far advanced, and it is time for Lord Malton to die. Accordingly Mr. Lister very judiciously despatches him; Granby inherits the estate — his virtues (for what shows off virtue like land?) are discovered by the Jermyns — and they marry in the last act.

Upon this slender story, the author has succeeded in making a very agreeable and interesting novel; and he has succeeded, we think, chiefly by the very easy and natural picture of manners, as they really exist among the upper classes: by the description of new characters judiciously drawn and faithfully preserved; and by the introduction of many striking and well-managed incidents; and we are particularly struck throughout the whole with the discretion and good sense of the author. He is never *nimious*; there is nothing in excess; there is a good deal of fancy and a great deal of spirit at work, but a directing and superintending judgment rarely quits him.

* This is the gentleman who now keeps the keys of Life and Death, the Janitor of the World.

We would instance, as a proof of his tact and talent, the visit at Lord Daventry's, and the description of characters of which the party is composed. There are absolutely no events; nobody runs away, goes mad, or dies. There is little of love, or of hatred; no great passion comes into play; but nothing can be further removed from dulness and insipidity. Who has ever lived in the world without often meeting the Miss Cliftons?

"The Miss Cliftons were good-humoured girls; not handsome, but of pleasing manners, and sufficiently clever to keep up the ball of conversation very agreeably for an occasional half hour. They were always *au courant du jour*, and knew and saw the first of everything—were in the earliest confidence of many a bride elect, and could frequently tell that a marriage was 'off' long after it had been announced as 'on the tapis' in the morning papers—always knew something of the new opera, or the new Scotch novel, before anybody else did—were the first who made fizgigs, or acted charades—contrived to have private views of most exhibitions, and were supposed to have led the fashionable throng to the Caledonian Chapel, Cross Street, Hatton Garden. Their employments were like those of most other girls: they sang, played, drew, rode, read occasionally, spoiled much muslin, manufactured purses, handscreens, and reticules for a repository, and transcribed a considerable quantity of music out of large fair print into diminutive manuscript.

"Miss Clifton was clever and accomplished; rather cold, but very conversible; collected seals, franks, and anecdotes of the day; and was a great retailer of the latter. Anne was odd and entertaining; was a formidable quizzer, and no mean caricaturist; liked fun in most shapes; and next to making people laugh, had rather they stared at what she said. Maria was the echo of the other two: vouched for all Miss Clifton's anecdotes, and led the laugh at Anne's repartees. They were plain, and they knew it; and cared less about it than young ladies usually do. Their plainness, however, would have been less striking, but for that hard, pale, parboiled town look,—that stamp of fashion, with which late hours and hot rooms generally endow the female face."—(pp. 103—105.)

Having introduced our reader to the Miss Cliftons, we must make him acquainted with Mr. Trebeck, one of those universally appearing gentlemen and tremendous table tyrants, by whom London society is so frequently governed:—

"Mr. Trebeck had great powers of entertainment, and a keen and lively turn for satire; and could talk down his superiors, whether in rank or talent, with very imposing confidence. He saw the advantages of being formidable, and observed with derision how those whose malignity he pampered with ridicule of others, vainly thought to purchase by subserviency exemption for themselves. He had sounded the gullibility of the world; knew the precise current value of pretension; and soon found himself the acknowledged umpire, the last appeal, of many contented followers.

"He seldom committed himself by praise or recommendation, but rather left his example and adoption to work its way. As for censure, he had both ample and witty store; but here too he often husbanded his remarks, and where it was needless or dangerous to define a fault, could check admiration by an incredulous smile, and depress pretensions of a season's standing by the raising of an eyebrow. He had a quick perception of the foibles of others, and a keen relish for bantering and exposing them. No keeper of a menagerie could better show off a monkey than he could an 'original.' He could ingeniously cause the unconscious subject to place his own absurdities in the best point of view, and would cloak his derision under the blandest cajolery. Imitators he loved much; but to baffle them—more. He loved to turn upon the luckless adopters of his last folly, and see them precipitately back out of the scrape into which he himself had led them.

"In the art of cutting he shone unrivalled; he knew the 'when,' the 'where,' and the 'how.' Without affecting useless short-sightedness, he could assume that calm but wandering gaze, which veers, as if unconsciously, round the proscribed individual; neither fixing, nor to be fixed; not looking on vacancy, nor on any one object; neither occupied nor abstracted; a look which perhaps excuses you to the person *cut*, and, at any rate, prevents him from accosting you. Originality was his idol. He wished to astonish, even if he did not amuse; and had rather say a silly thing than a commonplace one. He was led by this sometimes even to approach the verge of rudeness and vulgarity; but he had considerable tact, and a happy hardihood, which generally carried him through the difficulties into which his fearless love of originality brought him. Indeed, he well knew that what would, in the present condition of his reputation, be

scouted in anybody else, would pass current with the world in him. Such was the far-famed and redoubtable Mr. Trebeck."—(pp. 109—112.)

This sketch we think exceedingly clever. But we are not sure that its merit is fully sustained by the actual presentment of its subject. He makes his debut at dinner very characteristically, by gliding in quietly after it is half over; but in the dialogue which follows with Miss Jermyn, he seems to us a little too resolutely witty, and somewhat affectedly odd—though the whole scene is executed with spirit and talent.

"The Duke had been discoursing on cookery, when Mr. Trebeck turned to her, and asked in a low tone if she had ever met the Duke before—'I assure you,' said he, 'that upon *that* subject he is well worth attending to. He is supposed to possess more true science than any amateur of his day. By the by, what is the dish before you? It looks well, and I see you are eating some of it. Let me recommend it to him upon your authority; I dare not upon my own.'—'Then pray do not use mine.'—'Yes I will, with your permission; I'll tell him you thought, by what dropped from him in conversation, that it would exactly suit the genius of his taste. Shall I? Yes.—Duke,' (raising his voice a little, and speaking across the table,)—'Oh, no; how can you?'—'Why not?—Duke,' (with a glance at Caroline,) 'will you allow me to take wine with you?'—'I thought,' said she, relieved from her trepidation, and laughing slightly, 'you would never say anything so very strange.'—'You have too good an opinion of me; I blush for my unworthiness. But confess, that in fact you were rather alarmed at the idea of being held up to such a critic as the recommender of a bad dish.'—'Oh no, I was not thinking of that; but I hardly know the Duke; and it would have seemed so odd; and perhaps he might have thought that I had really told you to say something of that kind.'—'Of course he would; but you must not suppose that he would have been at all surprised at it. I'm afraid you are not aware of the full extent of your privileges, and are not conscious how many things young ladies can, and may, and will do.'—'Indeed I am not—perhaps you will instruct me.'—'Ah, I never do that for anybody. I like to see young ladies instruct themselves. It is better for them, and much more amusing to me. But, however, for once I will venture to tell you, that a very competent knowledge of the duties of women may, with proper attention, be picked up in a ball room.'—'Then I hope,' said she, laughing, 'you will attribute my deficiency to my little experience of balls. I have only been at two.'—'Only two! and one of them I suppose a race ball. Then you have not yet experienced any of the pleasures of a London season? Never had the dear delight of seeing and being seen, in a well of tall people at a rout, or passed a pleasant hour at a ball upon a staircase? I envy you. You have much to enjoy.'—'You do not mean that I really have?'—'Yes—really. But let me give you a caution or two. Never dance with any man without first knowing his character and condition, on the word of two credible chaperons. At balls, too, consider what you come for—to dance, of course, and not to converse; therefore, never talk yourself, nor encourage it in others.'—'I'm afraid I can only answer for myself.'—'Why, if foolish, well-meaning people will choose to be entertaining, I question if you have the power of frowning them down in a very forbidding manner; but I would give them no countenance nevertheless.'—'Your advice seems a little ironical.'—'Oh, you may either follow it or reverse it—that is its chief beauty. It is equally good taken either way.' After a slight pause he continued—'I hope you do not sing, or play, or draw, or do anything that everybody else does.'—'I am obliged to confess that I do a little—very little—in each.'—'I understand your "very little;" I'm afraid you are accomplished.'—'You need have no fear of that. But why are you an enemy to all accomplishments?'—'All accomplishments? Nay, surely, you do not think me an enemy to all? What can you possibly take me for?'—'I do not know,' said she, laughing slightly.—'Yes, I see you do not know exactly what to make of me—and you are not without your apprehensions. I can perceive that, though you try to conceal them.—But never mind. I am a safe person to sit near—sometimes. I am to-day. This is one of my lucid intervals. I'm much better, thanks to my keeper. There he is, on the other side of the table—the tall man in black,' (pointing out Mr. Bennet,) 'a highly respectable kind of person. I came with him here for change of air. How do you think I look at present?'—Caroline could not answer him for laughing.—'Nay,' said he, 'it is cruel to laugh on such a subject. It is very hard that you should do that, and misrepresent my meaning too.'—'Well then,' said Caroline, resuming a respectable portion of gravity, 'that I may not be guilty of that again, what accomplishments do you allow to be tolerable?'—'Let me see,' said he, with a

look of consideration; 'you may play a waltz with one hand, and dance as little as you think convenient. You may draw caricatures of your intimate friends. You may *not* sing a note of Rossini; nor sketch gate-posts and donkeys after nature. You may sit to a harp, but you need not play it. You must not paint miniatures nor copy Swiss costumes. But you may manufacture anything — from a cap down to a pair of shoes —always remembering that the less useful your work the better. Can you remember all this?'—'I do not know,' said she, 'it comprehends so much; and I am rather puzzled between the "mays" and "must nots." However, it seems, according to your code, that very little is to be required of me; for you have not mentioned anything that I positively *must* do.'—'Ah, well, I can reduce all to a very small compass. You must be an archeress in the summer, and a skater in the winter, and play well at billiards all the year; and if you do these extremely well, my admiration will have no bounds.'—'I believe I must forfeit all claim to your admiration then, for unfortunately I am not so gifted.'—'Then you must place it to the account of your other gifts.'—'Certainly—when it comes.'—'Oh! it is sure to come, as you well know: but, nevertheless, I like that incredulous look extremely.'—He then turned away, thinking probably that he had paid her the compliment of sufficient attention, and began a conversation with the Duchess, which was carried on in such a well-regulated undertone, as to be perfectly inaudible to any but themselves."—(pp. 92—99.)

The bustling importance of Sir Thomas Jermyn, the fat Duke, and his right-hand man the blunt toad-eater, Mr. Charlecote, a loud noisy sportsman, and Lady Jermyn's worldly prudence, are all displayed and managed with considerable skill and great power of amusing. One little sin against good taste our author sometimes commits — an error from which Sir Walter Scott is not exempt. We mean the humour of giving characteristic names to persons and places; for instance, Sir Thomas Jermyn is Member of Parliament for the town of Rottenborough. This very easy and appellative jocularity seems to us, we confess, to savour a little of vulgarity; and is therefore quite as unworthy of Mr. Lister, as Dr. Dryasdust is of Sir Walter Scott. The plainest names which can be found (Smith, Thomson, Johnson, and Simson, always excepted), are the best for novels. Lord Chesterton we have often met with; and suffered a good deal from his Lordship: a heavy, pompous, meddling peer, occupying a great share of the conversation — saying things in ten words which required only two, and evidently convinced that he is making a great impression; a large man, with a large head, and very landed manner; knowing enough to torment his fellow-creatures, not to instruct them — the ridicule of young ladies, and the natural butt and target of wit. It is easy to talk of carnivorous animals and beasts of prey; but does such a man, who lays waste a whole party of civilised beings by prosing, reflect upon the joys he spoils, and the misery he creates in the course of his life? and that any one who listens to him through politeness, would prefer tooth-ache or earache to his conversation? Does he consider the extreme uneasiness which ensues, when the company have discovered a man to be an extremely absurd person, at the same time that it is absolutely impossible to convey, by words or manner, the most distant suspicion of the discovery? And then, who punishes this bore? What sessions and what assizes for him? What bill is found against him? Who indicts him? When the judges have gone their vernal and autumnal rounds — the sheep-stealer disappears — the swindler gets ready for the Bay — the solid parts of the murderer are preserved in anatomical collections. But, after twenty years of crime, the bore is discovered in the same house, in the same attitude, eating the same soup — unpunished, untried, undissected — no scaffold, no skeleton — no mob of gentlemen and ladies to gape over his last dying speech and confession.

The scene of quizzing the country neighbours is well imagined, and not ill executed; though there are many more fortunate passages in the book. The elderly widows of the metropolis beg, through us, to return their thanks to Mr. Lister for the following agreeable portrait of Mrs. Dormer.

"It would be difficult to find a more pleasing example than Mrs. Dormer, of that much libelled class of elderly ladies of the world, who are presumed to be happy only at the card table; to grow in bitterness as they advance in years, and to haunt, like restless ghosts, those busy circles which they no longer either enliven or adorn. Such there may be; but of these she was not one. She was the frequenter of society, but not its slave. She had great natural benevolence of disposition; a friendly vivacity of manners, which endeared her to the young, and a steady good sense, which commanded the respect of her contemporaries; and many, who did not agree with her on particular points, were willing to allow that there was a good deal of reason in Mrs. Dormer's *prejudices*. She was, perhaps, a little blind to the faults of her friends; a defect of which the world could not cure her; but she was very kind to their virtues. She was fond of young people, and had an unimpaired gaiety about her, which seemed to expand in the contact with them; and she was anxious to promote, for their sake, even those amusements for which she had lost all taste herself. She was—but after all, she will be best described by negatives. She was not a match-maker, or mischief-maker; nor did she plume herself upon her charity, in implicitly believing only just half of what the world says. She was no retailer of scandalous '*on dits*.' She did not combat wrinkles with rouge; nor did she labour to render years less respected by a miserable affectation of girlish fashions. She did not stickle for the inviolable exclusiveness of certain sects; nor was she afraid of being known to visit a friend in an unfashionable quarter of the town. She was no worshipper of mere rank. She did not patronise oddities; nor sanction those who delight in braving the rules of common decency. She did not evince her sense of propriety, by shaking hands with the recent defendant in a Crim. Con. cause; nor exhale her devotion in Sunday routs."—(pp. 243, 244.)

Mrs. Clotworthy, we are afraid, will not be quite so well pleased with the description of her rout. Mrs. Clotworthy is one of those ladies who have ices, fiddlers, and fine rooms, but no fine friends. But fine friends may always be had, where there are ices, fiddlers, and fine rooms: and so, with ten or a dozen stars and an Oonalaska chief, and followed by all vicious and salient London, Mrs. Clotworthy takes the field.

"The poor woman seemed half dead with fatigue already; and we cannot venture to say whether the prospect of five hours more of this high-wrought enjoyment tended much to brace her to the task. It was a brilliant sight, and an interesting one, if it could have been viewed from some fair vantage ground, with ample space, in coolness and in quiet. Rank, beauty, and splendour, were richly blended. The gay attire; the glittering jewels; the more resplendent features they adorned, and too frequently the rouged cheek of the sexagenarian: the vigilant chaperon; the fair but languid form which she conducted; well curled heads, well propped with starch; well whiskered guardsmen! and here and there fat good-humoured elderly gentlemen, with stars upon their coats;—all these united in one close medley—a curious piece of living mosaic. Most of them came to see and be seen; some of the most youthful professedly to dance; yet how could they? at any rate they tried.—They stood, if they could, with their vis-à-vis facing them,—and sidled across—and back again and made one step,—or two if there was room, to the right or left, and joined hands and set—perhaps, and turned their partners, or dispensed with it if necessary—and so on to the end of 'La Finale;' and then comes a waltz for the few who choose it—and then another squeezy quadrille—and so on—and on, till the weary many 'leave ample room and verge enough' for the persevering few to figure in with greater freedom.

"But then they talk; oh! ay! true we must not forget the charms of conversation. And what passes between nine-tenths of them! Remarks on the heat of the room; the state of the crowd; the impossibility of dancing, and the propriety nevertheless of attempting it; that on last Wednesday was a bad Almack's, and on Thursday a worse Opera; that the new ballet is supposed to be good; mutual inquiries how they like Pasta, or Catalani, or whoever the syren of the day may be; whether they have been at Lady A.'s, and whether they are going to Mrs. B.'s; whether they think Miss Such-a-one handsome; and what is the name of the gentleman talking to her; whether Rossini's music makes the best quadrilles, and whether Collinet's band are the best to play them. There are many who pay in better coin; but the small change is much of this description."—(Vol. I. pp. 249—251.)

We consider the following description of London, as it appears to a person walking home after a rout, at four or five o'clock in the morning, to be as poetical as anything written on

the forests of Guiana, or the falls of Niagara:—

"Granby followed them with his eyes; and now, too full of happiness to be accessible to any feelings of jealousy or repining, after a short reverie of the purest satisfaction, he left the ball, and sallied out into the fresh cool air of a summer morning—suddenly passing from the red glare of lamplight, to the clear sober brightness of returning day. He walked cheerfully onward, refreshed and exhilarated by the air of morning, and interested with the scene around him. It was broad day-light, and he viewed the town under an aspect in which it is alike presented to the late retiring votary of pleasure, and to the early rising sons of business. He stopped on the pavement of Oxford Street, to contemplate the effect. The whole extent of that long vista, unclouded by the mid-day smoke, was distinctly visible to his eye at once. The houses shrunk to half their span, while the few visible spires of the adjacent churches seemed to rise less distant than before, gaily tipped with early sunshine, and much diminished in apparent size, but heightened in distinctness and in beauty. Had it not been for the cool grey tint which slightly mingled with every object, the brightness was almost that of noon. But the life, the bustle, the busy din, the flowing tide of human existence, were all wanting to complete the similitude. All was hushed and silent; and this mighty receptacle of human beings, which a few short hours would wake into active energy and motion, seemed like a city of the dead.

"There was little to break this solemn illusion. Around were the monuments of human exertion, but the hands which formed them were no longer there. Few, if any, were the symptoms of life. No sounds were heard but the heavy creaking of a solitary waggon; the twittering of an occasional sparrow; the monotonous tone of the drowsy watchman; and the distant rattle of the retiring carriage, fading on the ear till it melted into silence; and the eye that searched for living objects fell on nothing but the grim great-coated guardian of the night, muffled up into an appearance of doubtful character between bear and man, and scarcely distinguishable, by the colour of his dress, from the brown flags along which he sauntered."—(pp. 297—299.)

One of the most prominent characters of the book, and the best drawn, is that of Tyrrel, son of Lord Malton, a noble blackleg, a titled gamester, and a profound plotting villain — a man, in comparison of whom nine-tenths of the persons hung in Newgate are pure and perfect. The profound dissimulation and wicked artifices of this diabolical person are painted with great energy and power of description. The party at whist made to take in Granby is very good, and that part of the story where Granby compels Tyrrel to refund what he has won of Courtenay is of first-rate dramatic excellence; and if any one wishes for a short and convincing proof of the powers of the writer of this novel—to that scene we refer him. It shall be the taster of the cheese, and we are convinced it will sell the whole article. We are so much struck with it that we advise the author to consider seriously whether he could not write a good play. It is many years since a good play has been written. It is about time, judging from the common economy of nature, that a good dramatic writer should appear. We promise Mr. Lister sincerely, that the Edinburgh Review shall rapidly undeceive him if he mistake his talents: and that his delusion shall not last beyond the first tragedy or comedy.

The picture at the exhibition is extremely well managed, and all the various love-tricks of attempting to appear indifferent, are, as well as we can remember, from the life. But it is thirty or forty years since we have been in love.

The horror of an affectionate and dexterous mamma is a handsome young man without money; and the following lecture deserves to be committed to memory by all managing mothers, and repeated at proper intervals to the female progeny.

"'True, my love, but understand me. I don't wish you positively to *avoid* him. I would not go away, for instance, if I saw him coming, or even turn my head that I might not see him as he passed. That would be too *broad* and marked. People might notice it. It would look *particular*. We should never do anything that looks *particular*. No, I would answer him civilly and composedly whenever he spoke to me, and then pass on, just as you might in the case of anybody else. But I leave all this to your own tact and discretion, of

which nobody has more for her age. I am sure you can enter into all these niceties, and that my observations will not be lost upon you. And now, my love, let me mention another thing. You must get over that little embarrassment which I see you show whenever you meet him. It was very natural and excusable the first time, considering our long acquaintance with him and the General: but we must make our conduct conform to circumstances; so try to get the better of this little flutter: it does not look well, and might be observed. There is no quality more valuable in a young person than self-possession. So you must keep down these blushes,' said she, patting her on the cheek, 'or I believe I must rouge you:—though it would be a thousand pities, with the pretty natural colour you have. But you must remember what I have been saying. Be more composed in your behaviour. Try to adopt the manner which I do. It may be difficult; but you see I contrive it, and I have known Mr. Granby a great deal longer than you have, Caroline.' "—(pp. 21, 22.)

These principles are of the highest practical importance in an age when the art of marrying daughters is carried to the highest pitch of excellence, when love must be made to the young men of fortune, not only by the young lady, who must appear to be dying for him, but by the father, mother, aunts, cousins, tutor, gamekeeper, and stable boy—assisted by the parson of the parish, and the churchwardens. If any of these fail, Dives pouts, and the match is off.

The merit of this writer is, that he catches delicate portraits which a less skilful artist would pass over, from not thinking the features sufficiently marked. We are struck, however, with the resemblance, and are pleased with the conquest of difficulties—we remember to have seen such faces, and are sensible that they form an agreeable variety to the expression of more marked and decided character. Nobody, for instance, can deny that he is acquainted with Miss Darrell.

"Miss Darrell was not strictly a beauty. She had not, as was frequently observed by her female friends, and unwillingly admitted by her male admirers, a single truly good feature in her face. But who could quarrel with the *tout ensemble?* who but must be dazzled with the graceful animation with which those features were lighted up? Let critics hesitate to pronounce her beautiful; at any rate they must allow her to be fascinating. Place her a perfect stranger in a crowded assembly, and she would first attract his eye; correcter beauties would pass unnoticed, and his first attention would be riveted by her. She was all brilliancy and effect; but it were hard to say she studied it; so little did her spontaneous, airy graces convey the impression of premeditated practice. She was a sparkling tissue of little affectations, which, however, appeared so interwoven with herself, that their seeming artlessness disarmed one's censure. Strip them away, and you destroyed at once the brilliant being that so much attracted you; and it thus became difficult to condemn what you felt unable, and, indeed, unwilling, to remove. With positive affectation, malevolence itself could rarely charge her; and prudish censure seldom exceeded the guarded limits of a dry remark, that Miss Darrell had 'a good deal of manner.'

"Eclat she sought, and gained. Indeed, she was both formed to gain it, and disposed to desire it. But she required an extensive sphere. A ball-room was her true arena: for she waltzed '*à ravir*,' and could talk enchantingly about nothing. She was devoted to fashion, and all its ficklenesses, and went to the extreme whenever she could do so consistently with grace. But she aspired to be a leader as well as a follower; seldom, if ever, adopted a mode that was unbecoming to herself, and dressed to suit the genius of her face."—(pp. 28, 29.)

Tremendous is the power of a novelist! If four or five men are in a room, and show a disposition to break the peace, no human magistrate (not even Mr. Justice Bayley) could do more than bind them over to keep the peace, and commit them if they refused. But the writer of the novel stands with a pen in his hand, and can run any of them through the body—can knock down any one individual, and keep the others upon their legs; or, like the last scene in the first tragedy written by a young man of genius, can put them all to death. Now, an author possessing such extraordinary privileges, should not have allowed Mr. Tyrrel to strike Granby. This is ill managed; particularly as Granby does not return the blow, or turn him out of the house. Nobody should suffer his hero to have a black eye, or to be

pulled by the nose. The Iliad would never have come down to these times if Agamemnon had given Achilles a box on the ear. We should have trembled for the Æneid if any Tyrian nobleman had kicked the pious Æneas, in the 4th book. Æneas may have deserved it; but he could not have founded the Roman Empire after so distressing an accident.

HAMILTON'S METHOD OF TEACHING LANGUAGES.

(E. Review, 1826.)

1. *The Gospel of St. John, in Latin, adapted to the Hamiltonian System, by an Analytical and Interlineary Translation.* Executed under the immediate Direction of James Hamilton. London. 1824.
2. *The Gospel of St. John, adapted to the Hamiltonian System, by an Analytical and Interlineary Translation from the Italian, with full Instructions for its use, even by those who are wholly ignorant of the Language. For the Use of Schools.* By James Hamilton, Author of the Hamiltonian System. London. 1825.

We have nothing whatever to do with Mr. Hamilton personally. He may be the wisest or the weakest of men; most dexterous or most unsuccessful in the exhibition of his system; modest and proper, or prurient and preposterous in its commendation;—by none of these considerations is his system itself affected.

The proprietor of Ching's Lozenges must necessarily have recourse to a newspaper to rescue from oblivion the merit of his vermifuge medicines. In the same manner, the Amboyna tooth-powder must depend upon the Herald and the Morning Post. Unfortunately, the system of Mr. Hamilton has been introduced to the world by the same means, and has exposed itself to those suspicions which hover over splendid discoveries of genius detailed in the daily papers, and sold in sealed boxes at an infinite diversity of prices — but with a perpetual inclusion of the stamp, and with an equitable discount for undelayed payment.

It may have been necessary for Mr. Hamilton to have had recourse to these means of making known his discoveries; since he may not have had friends whose names and authority might have attracted the notice of the public; but it is a misfortune to which his system has been subjected, and a difficulty which it has still to overcome. There is also a singular and somewhat ludicrous condition of giving *warranted lessons*; by which is meant, we presume, that the money is to be returned if the progress is not made. We should be curious to know how poor Mr. Hamilton would protect himself from some swindling scholars, who, having really learnt all that the master professed to teach, should counterfeit the grossest ignorance of the Gospel of St. John, and refuse to construe a single verse, or to pay a farthing.

Whether Mr. Hamilton's translations are good or bad is not the question. The point to determine is, whether very close interlineal translations are helps in learning a language? not whether Mr. Hamilton has executed these translations faithfully and judiciously. Whether Mr. Hamilton is or is not the inventor of the system which bears his name, and what his claims to originality may be, are also questions of very second-rate importance; but they merit a few observations. That man is not the discoverer of any art who first says the thing; but he who says it so long, and so loud, and so clearly, that he compels mankind to hear him — the man who is so deeply impressed with the importance of the discovery, that he will take no denial: but, at the risk of fortune and fame, pushes through all opposition, and is determined that what he thinks he has discovered shall not perish for want of a fair trial. Other persons had noticed the effect of coal gas in producing light; but Winsor worried the town with bad English for three winters before he could attract any serious attention to his views. Many persons broke stone before Macadam; but Macadam felt the discovery more strongly, stated it more clearly, per-

severed in it with greater tenacity, — wielded his hammer, in short, with greater force then other men, and finally succeeded in bringing his plan into general use.

Literal translations are not only not used in our public schools, but are generally discountenanced in them. A literal translation, or any translation of a school-book, is a contraband article in English schools, which a schoolmaster would instantly seize, as a Custom-house officer would a barrel of gin. Mr. Hamilton, on the other hand, maintains, by books and lectures, that all boys ought to be allowed to work with literal translations, and that it is by far the best method of learning a language. If Mr. Hamilton's system is just, it is sad trifling to deny his claim to originality, by stating that Mr. Locke has said the same thing, or that others have said the same thing, a century earlier than Hamilton. They have all said it so feebly, that their observations have passed *sub silentio;* and if Mr. Hamilton succeeds in being heard and followed, to him be the glory — because from him have proceeded the utility and the advantage.

The works upon this subject on this plan published before the time of Mr. Hamilton are, Montanus's edition of the Bible, with Pignini's interlineary Latin version ; Lubin's New Testament, having the Greek interlined with Latin and German ; Abbé L'Olivet's Pensées de Cicero ; and a French work by the Abbé Radonvilliers, Paris, 1768 — and Locke upon Education.

One of the first principles of Mr. Hamilton is, to introduce very strict literal interlinear translations, as aids to lexicons and dictionaries, and to make so much use of them as that the dictionary or lexicon will be for a long time little required. We will suppose the language to be the Italian, and the book selected to be the Gospel of St. John. Of this Gospel Mr. Hamilton has published a key, of which the following is an extract: —

"1. Nel principio era il Verbo, e il Verbo era appresso Dio, e il Verbo era Dio.
In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was near to God, and the Word was God.

"2. Questo era nel principio appresso Dio.
This was in the beginning near to God.

"3. Per mezzo di lui tutte le cose furon fatte: e senza di lui nulla fu fatto di ciò, che è stata fatto.
By means of him all the things were made: and without of him nothing was made of that, of which is been made.

"4. In lui era la vita, e la vita era la luce degli uomini:
In him was the life, and the life was the light of the men:

"5. E la luce splende tra le tenebre, e le tenebre hanno non ammessa la.
And the light shines among the darkness, and the darknesses have not admitted her.

"6. Vi fu un uomo mandato da Dio che nomava si Giovanni.
There was a man sent by God who did name himself John.

"7. Questi venne qual testimone, affin di rendere testimonianza alla luce, onde per mezzo di lui tutti credessero."
This came like as witness in order of to render testimony to the light, whence by mean of him all might believe."

In this way Mr. Hamilton contends (and appears to us to contend justly), that the language may be acquired with much greater ease and despatch than by the ancient method of beginning with grammar and proceeding with the dictionary. We will presume, at present, that the only object is to read, not to write or speak, Italian ; and that the pupil instructs himself from the Key, without a master, and is not taught in a class. We wish to compare the plan of finding the English word in such a literal translation to that of finding it in dictionaries — and the method of ending with grammar, or of taking the grammar at an advanced period of knowledge in the language, rather than at the beginning. Every one will admit that of all the disgusting labours of life, the labour of lexicon and dictionary is the most intolerable. Nor is there a greater object of compassion than a fine boy, full of animal spirits, set down in a bright

sunny day, with a heap of unknown words before him to be turned into English, before supper, by the help of a ponderous dictionary alone. The object in looking into a dictionary can only be to exchange an unknown sound for one that is known. Now it seems indisputable, that the sooner this exchange is made the better. The greater the number of such exchanges which can be made in a given time, the greater is the progress, the more abundant the *copia verborum* obtained by the scholar. Would it not be of advantage if the dictionary at once opened at the required page, and if a self-moving index at once pointed to the requisite word ? Is any advantage gained to the world by the time employed first in finding the letter P, and then in finding the three guiding letters P R I ? This appears to us to be pure loss of time, justifiable only if it be inevitable : and even after this is done, what an infinite multitude of difficulties are heaped at once upon the wretched beginner ! Instead of being reserved for his greater skill and maturity in the language, he must employ himself in discovering in which of many senses which his dictionary presents the word is to be used ; in considering the case of the substantive, and the syntaxical arrangement in which it is to be placed, and the relation it bears to other words. The loss of time in the merely mechanical part of the old plan is immense. We doubt very much, if an average boy, between ten and fourteen, will look out or find more than sixty words in an hour ; we say nothing, at present, of the time employed in thinking of the meaning of each word when he has found it, but of the mere naked discovery of the word in the lexicon or dictionary. It must be remembered, we say an *average* boy — not what Master Evans, the show-boy, can do ; nor what Master Macarthy, the boy who is whipt every day can do ; but some boy between Macarthy and Evans : and not what this medium boy can do while his mastigophorous superior is frowning over him, but what he actually does when left in the midst of noisy boys, and with a recollection that by sending to the neighbouring shop, he can obtain any quantity of unripe gooseberries upon credit. Now, if this statement be true, and if there are 10,000 words in the Gospel of St. John, here are 160 hours employed in the mere digital process of turning over leaves ! But in much less time than this, any boy of average quickness might learn, by the Hamiltonian method, to construe the whole four Gospels, with the greatest accuracy and the most scrupulous correctness. The interlineal translation, of course, spares the trouble and time of this mechanical labour. Immediately under the Italian word is placed the English word. The unknown sound therefore is *instantly* exchanged for one that is known. The labour here spared is of the most irksome nature, and it is spared at a time of life the most averse to such labour ; and so painful is this labour to many boys, that it forms an insuperable obstacle to their progress: they prefer to be flogged, or to be sent to sea. It is useless to say of any medicine that it is valuable, if it is so nauseous that the patient flings it away. You must give me, not the best medicine you have in your shop, but the best you can get me to take.

We have hitherto been occupied with finding the word : we will now suppose, after running a dirty finger down many columns, and after many sighs and groans, that the word is found. We presume the little fellow working in the true orthodox manner, without any translation : he is in pursuit of the Greek word Βαλλω, and after a long chase, seizes it, as greedily as a bailiff possesses himself of a fugacious captain. But, alas ! the vanity of human wishes !—the never-sufficiently-to-be-pitied stripling has scarcely congratulated himself upon his success, when he finds Βαλλω to contain the following meanings in Hederick's Lexicon :— 1. Jacio ; 2. Jaculor ; 3. Ferio ; 4. Figo ; 5. Saucio ; 6. Attingo ; 7. Projicio ; 8. Emitto ; 9. Profundo ; 10. Pono ; 11. Immitto ; 12. Trado; 13. Committo ; 14. Condo ; 15. Ædifico ; 16. Verso ; 17. Flecto.

Suppose the little rogue, not quite at home in the Latin tongue, to be desirous of affixing English significations to these various words, he has then, at the moderate rate of six meanings to every Latin word, one hundred and two meanings to the word Βαλλω ! or, if he is content with the Latin, he has then only seventeen.*

Words, in their origin, have a natural or primary sense. The accidental associations of the people who use it, afterwards give to that word a great number of secondary meanings. In some words the primary meaning is very common, and the secondary meaning very rare. In other instances it is just the reverse ; and in very many the particular secondary meaning is pointed out by some proposition which accompanies it, or some case by which it is accompanied. But an accurate translation points these things out gradually as its proceeds. The common and most probable meanings of the word Βαλλω, or of any other word, are, in the Hamiltonian method, insensibly but surely fixed on the mind, which, by the lexicon method, must be done by a tentative process, frequently ending in gross error, noticed with peevishness, punished with severity, consuming a great deal of time, and for the most part only corrected, after all, by the accurate *vivâ voce* translation of the master — or, in other words, by the Hamiltonian method.

The recurrence to a translation is treated in our schools as a species of imbecility and meanness ; just as if there was any other dignity here than utility, any other object in learning languages, than to turn something you do not understand, into something you do understand, and as if that was not the best method which effected this object in the shortest and simplest manner. Hear upon this point the judicious Locke :—"But if such e man cannot be got, who speaks good Latin, and being able to instruct your son in all these parts of knowledge, will undertake it by this method ; the next best is to have him taught as near this way as may be—which is by taking some easy and pleasant book, such as Æsop's Fables, and writing the English translation (made as literal as it can be) in one line, and the Latin words which answer each of them just over it in another. These let him read every day over and over again, till he perfectly understands the Latin ; and then go on to another fable, till he be also perfect in that, not omitting what he is already perfect in, but sometimes reviewing that, to keep it in his memory ; and when he comes to write, let these be set him for copies, which, with the exercise of his hand, will also advance him in Latin. This being a more imperfect way than by talking Latin unto him, the formation of the verbs first, and afterwards the declensions of the nouns and pronouns perfectly learned by heart, may facilitate his acquaintance with the genius and manner of the Latin tongue, which varies the signification of verbs and nouns not as the modern languages do, by particles prefixed, but by changing the last syllables. More than this of grammar I think he need not have till he can read himself 'Sanctii Minerva'— with Scioppius and Perigonius's notes." — (*Locke on Education*, p. 74. folio.)

Another recommendation which we have not mentioned in the Hamiltonian system is, that it can be combined, and is constantly combined, with the system of Lancaster. The Key is probably sufficient for those who have no access to classes and schools : but in a Hamiltonian school during the lesson, it is not left to the option of the child to trust to the Key alone. The master stands in the middle, translates accurately and literally the whole verse,

* In addition to the other needless difficulties and miseries entailed upon children who are learning languages, their Greek Lexicons give a Latin instead of an English translation ; and a boy of twelve or thirteen years of age, whose attainments in Latin are of course but moderate, is expected to make it the vehicle of knowledge for other languages. This is setting the short-sighted and blear-eyed to lead the blind ; and is one of those afflicting pieces of absurdity which escape animadversion, because they are, and have long been, of daily occurrence. Mr. Jones has published an English and Greek Lexicon, which we recommend to the notice of all persons engaged in education, and not sacramented against all improvement.

and then ask the boys the English of separate words, or challenges them to join the words together, as he has done. A perpetual attention and activity is thus kept up. The master, or a scholar (turned into a temporary Lancasterian master), acts as a living lexicon ; and, if the thing is well done, as a lively and animating lexicon. How is it possible to compare this with the solitary wretchedness of a poor lad of the desk and lexicon, suffocated with the nonsense of grammarians, overwhelmed with every species of difficulty disproportionate to his age, and driven by despair to peg-top, or marbles ?

"Taking these principles as a basis, the teacher forms his class of *eight, ten, twenty,* or *one hundred,*—the number is of little moment, it being as easy to teach a greater as a smaller one,—and brings them at once to the language itself, by reciting, with a loud articulate voice, the first verse thus :—*In* in, *principio* in beginning, *Verbum* Word, *erat* was, *et* and, *Verbum* Word, *erat* was, *apud* at, *Deum* God, *et* and, *Verbum* Word, *erat* was, *Deus* God. Having recited the verse once or twice himself, it is then recited *precisely* in the same manner by any person of the class whom he may judge most capable; the person copying his manner and intonations as much as possible.—When the verse has been thus recited, by *six* or *eight* persons of the class, the teacher recites the 2nd verse in the same manner, which is recited as the former by any members of the class; and thus continues until he has recited from *ten* to *twelve* verses, which usually constitute the first lesson of one hour.—In three lessons, the first Chapter may be thus readily translated, the teacher gradually diminishing the number of repetitions of the same verse till the *fourth* lesson, when each member of the class translates his verse in turn from the mouth of the teacher; from which period *fifty, sixty,* or even *seventy,* verses may be translated in the time of a lesson, or one hour. At the *seventh* lesson, it is invariably found that the class can translate without the assistance of the teacher farther than for occasional correction, and for those words which they may not have met in the preceding chapters. But, to accomplish this, it is absolutely necessary that every member of the class know *every word* of all the preceding lessons; which is however an easy task, the words being always taught him in class, and the pupil besides being able to refer to the key whenever he is at a loss—the key being translated in the very words which the teacher has used in the class, from which, as before remarked, he must never deviate.—In *ten* lessons, it will be found that the class can readily translate the whole of the Gospel of St. John, which is called the first section of the course.—Should any delay, from any cause, prevent them, it is in my classes always for account of teacher, who gives the extra lesson or lessons always *gratis*.—It cannot be too deeply impressed on the mind of the pupil that *a perfect knowledge of every word* of his first section is most important to the ease and comfort of his future progress.—At the end of *ten* lessons, or first section, the custom of my Establishments is to give the pupil the *Epitome Historiæ Sacræ*, which is provided with a key in the same manner.—It was first used in our classes for the first and second sections; we now teach it in one section of *ten* lessons, which we find easier than to teach it in two sections before the pupil has read the Testament.—When he has read the Epitome, it will be then time to give him the theory of the verbs and other words which change their terminations.—He has already acquired a good practical knowledge of these things; the theory becomes then very easy.—A grammar containing the declensions and conjugations, and printed specially for my classes, is then put into the pupil's hands (not to be got by heart,—nothing is ever got by rote on this system), but that he may comprehend more readily his teacher, who lectures on grammar generally, but especially on the verbs. From this time, that is, from the beginning of the *third* section, the pupil studies the theory and construction of the language as well as its practice. For this purpose he reads the ancient authors, beginning with Cæsar, which, together with the *Selecta e Profanis*, fills usefully the *third* and *fourth* sections. When these with the preceding books are well known, the pupil will find little difficulty in reading the authors usually read in schools. The *fifth* and *sixth* sections consist of Virgil and Horace, enough of which is read to enable the pupil to read them with facility, and to give him correct ideas of Prosody and Versification. Five or six months, with mutual attention on the part of pupil and teacher, will be found sufficient to acquire a knowledge of this language, which hitherto has *rarely* been the result of as many years."

We have before said, that the Hamiltonian's system must not depend upon Mr. Hamilton's method of carrying it into execution; for instance, he banishes from his schools the effects of emu-

lation. The boys do not take each other's places. This, we think, is a sad absurdity. A cook might as well resolve to make bread without fermentation, as a pedagogue to carry on a school without emulation. It must be a sad doughy lump without this vivifying principle. Why are boys to be shut out from a class of feelings to which society owes so much, and upon which their conduct in future life must (if they are worth anything) be so closely constructed? Poet A writes verses to outshine poet B. Philosopher C sets up roasting Titanium, and boiling Chromium, that he may be thought more of than philosopher D. Mr. Jackson strives to out-paint Sir Thomas; Sir Thomas Lethbridge to overspeak Mr. Canning; and so society gains good chemists, poets, painters, speakers, and orators; and why are not boys to be emulous as well as men?

If a boy were in Paris, would he learn the language better by shutting himself up to read French books with a dictionary, or by conversing freely with all whom he met? and what is conversation but an Hamiltonian school? Every man you meet is a living lexicon and grammar — who is perpetually changing your English into French, and perpetually instructing you, in spite of yourself, in the terminations of French substantives and verbs. The analogy is still closer, if you converse with persons of whom you can ask questions, and who will be at the trouble of correcting you. What madness would it be to run away from these pleasing facilities, as too dangerously easy — to stop your ears, to double-lock the door, and to look out *chickens; taking a walk;* and *fine weather*, in Boyer's Dictionary — and then by the help of Chambaud's Grammar, to construct a sentence which should signify, "*Come to my house, and eat some chickens, if it is fine!*" But there is in England almost a love of difficulty and needless labour. We are so resolute and industrious in raising up impediments which ought to be overcome, that there is a sort of suspicion against the removal of these impediments, and a notion that the advantage is not fairly come by without the previous toil. If the English were in a paradise of spontaneous productions, they would continue to dig and plough, though they were never a peach nor a pine-apple the better for it.

A principal point to attend to in the Hamiltonian system, is the prodigious number of words and phrases which pass through the boy's mind, compared with those which are presented to him by the old plan. As a talkative boy learns French sooner in France than a silent boy, so a translator of books learns sooner to construe, the more he translates. An Hamiltonian makes, in six or seven lessons, three or four hundred times as many exchanges of English for French or Latin, as a grammar schoolboy can do; and if he lose 50 per cent. of all he hears, his progress is still, beyond all possibility of comparison, more rapid.

As for pronunciation of living languages, we see no reason why that consideration should be introduced in this place. We are decidedly of opinion, that all living languages are best learnt in the country where they are spoken, or by living with those who come from that country; but if that cannot be, Mr. Hamilton's method is better than the grammar and dictionary method. *Cæteris paribus*, Mr. Hamilton's method, as far as French is concerned, would be better in the hands of a Frenchman, and his Italian method in the hands of an Itahan; but all this has nothing to do with the system.

"Have I read through Lilly?—have I learnt by heart that most atrocious monument of absurdity, the Westminster Grammar? — have I been whipt for the substantives? — whipt for the verbs? — and whipt for and with the interjections? — have I picked the sense slowly, and word by word, out of Hederick? — and shall my son Daniel be exempt from all this misery? — Shall a little unknown person in Cecil Street, Strand, No. 25., pretend to tell me that all this is unnecessary? — Was it possible that I

might have been spared all this? — The whole system is nonsense, and the man an impostor. If there had been any truth in it, it must have occurred to some one else before this period." — This is a very common style of observation upon Mr. Hamilton's system, and by no means an uncommon wish of the mouldering and decaying part of mankind, that the next generation should not enjoy any advantages from which they themselves have been precluded. — "*Ay, ay, it's all mighty well — but I went through this myself, and I am determined my children shall do the same.*" We are convinced that a great deal of opposition to improvement proceeds upon this principle. Crabbe might make a good picture of an unbenevolent old man, slowly retiring from this sublunary scene, and lamenting that the coming race of men would be less bumped on the roads, better lighted in the streets, and less tormented with grammars and lexicons, than in the preceding age. A great deal of compliment to the wisdom of ancestors, and a great degree of alarm at the dreadful spirit of innovation, are soluble into mere jealousy and envy.

But what is to become of a boy who has no difficulties to grapple with? How enervated will that understanding be, to which everything is made so clear, plain, and easy! — no hills to walk up, no chasms to step over; everything graduated, soft, and smooth. All this, however, is an objection to the multiplication table, to Napier's bones, and to every invention for the abridgment of human labour. There is no dread of any lack of difficulties. Abridge intellectual labour by any process you please — multiply mechanical powers to any extent — there will be sufficient, and infinitely more than sufficient, of laborious occupation for the mind and body of man. Why is the boy to be idle? — By and by comes the book without a key; by and by comes the lexicon. They do come at last — though at a better period. But if they did not come — if they were useless, if language could be attained without them — would any human being wish to retain difficulties for their own sake which led to nothing useful, and by the annihilation of which our faculties were left to be exercised by difficulties which *do* lead to something useful — by mathematics, natural philosophy, and every branch of useful knowledge? Can any be so anserous as to suppose, that the faculties of young men cannot be exercised, and their industry and activity called into proper action, because Mr. Hamilton teaches, in three or four years, what has (in a more vicious system) demanded seven or eight? Besides, even in the Hamiltonian method it is very easy for one boy to outstrip another. Why may not a clever and ambitious boy employ three hours upon his key by himself, while another boy has only employed one? There is plenty of corn to thrash, and of chaff to be winnowed away, in Mr. Hamilton's system; the difference is, that every blow tells, because it is properly directed. In the old way half their force was lost in air. There is a mighty foolish apophthegm of Dr. Bell's*, that it is not what is done for a boy that is of importance, but what a boy does for himself. This is just as wise as to say, that it is not the breeches which are made for a boy that can cover his nakedness, but the breeches he makes for himself. All this entirely depends upon a comparison of the time saved, by showing the boy how to do a thing, rather than by leaving him to do it for himself. Let the object be, for example, to make a pair of shoes. The boy will effect this object much better if you show him how to make the shoes, than if you merely give him wax, thread, and leather, and leave him to find out all the ingenious abridgments of labour which have been discovered by experience. The object is to turn Latin into English. The scholar will do it much better and sooner if the word is found for him, than if he finds it — much better and sooner if you point out the effect of the terminations, and the nature of the syntax, than if you leave him to detect them for himself.

* A very foolish old gentleman, seized on eagerly by the Church of England to defraud Lancaster of his discovery.

The thing *is* at last done *by the pupil himself* — for he reads the language — which was the thing to be done. All the help he has received has only enabled him to make a more economical use of his time, and to gain his end sooner. Never be afraid of wanting difficulties for your pupil; if means are rendered more easy, more will be expected. The animal will be compelled or induced to do all that he can do. Macadam has made the roads better. Dr. Bell would have predicted that the horses would get too fat: but the actual result is, that they are compelled to go ten miles an hour instead of eight.

"For teaching children, this, too, I think is to be observed, that, in most cases, where they stick, they are not to be further puzzled, by putting them upon finding it out themselves; as by asking such questions as these; viz.— which is the nominative case in the sentence they are to construe? or demanding what 'aufero' signifies, to lead them to the knowledge what 'abstulere' signifies, &c., when they cannot readily tell. This wastes time only, in disturbing them; for whilst they are learning, and apply themselves with attention, they are to be kept in good humour, and everything made easy to them, and as pleasant as possible. Therefore, wherever they are at a stand, and are willing to go forwards, help them presently over the difficulty, without any rebuke or chiding; remembering that, where harsher ways are taken, they are the effect only of pride and peevishness in the teacher, who expects children should instantly be masters of as much as he knows; whereas he should rather consider, that his business is to settle in them *habits*, not angrily to inculcate *rules*."—(*Locke on Education*, p. 74.)

Suppose the first five books of Herodotus to be acquired by a key, or literal translation after the method of Hamilton, so that the pupil could construe them with the greatest accuracy;— we do not pretend, because the pupil could construe this book, that he could construe any other book equally easy; we merely say, that the pupil has acquired, by these means, a certain *copia verborum*, and a certain practical knowledge of grammar, which must materially diminish the difficulty of reading the next book; that his difficulties diminish in a compound ratio with every fresh book he reads with a key — till at last he reads any common book, without a key — and that he attains this last point of perfection in a time incomparably less, and with difficulties incomparably smaller, than in the old method.

There are a certain number of French books, which when a boy can construe accurately, he may be said, for all purposes of reading, to be master of the French language. No matter how he has attained this power of construing the books. If you try him thoroughly, and are persuaded he is perfectly master of the books — then he possesses the power in question — he understands the language. Let these books, for the sake of the question, be Telemachus, the History of Louis XIV. the Henriade, the Plays of Racine, and the Revolutions of Vertot. We would have Hamiltonian keys to all these books, and the Lancasterian method of instruction. We believe these books would be mastered in one sixth part of the time, by these means, that they would be by the old method, of looking out the words in the dictionary, and then coming to say the lesson to the master; and we believe that the boys, long before they came to the end of this series of books, would be able to do without their keys — to fling away their cork jackets, and to swim alone. But boys who learn a language in four or five months, it is said, are apt to forget it again. Why, then, does not a young person, who has been five or six months in Paris, forget his French four or five years afterwards? It has been obtained without any of that labour, which the objectors to the Hamiltonian system deem to be so essential to memory. It has been obtained in the midst of tea and bread and butter, and yet is in a great measure retained for a whole life. In the same manner the pupils of this new school use a colloquial living dictionary, and, from every principle of youthful

emulation, contend with each other in catching the interpretation, and in applying to the lesson before them.

"If you wish boys to remember any language, make the acquisition of it very tedious and disgusting." This seems to be an odd rule ; but if it be good for language, it must be good also for every species of knowledge — music, mathematics, navigation, architecture. In all these sciences aversion should be the parent of memory — impediment the cause of perfection. If difficulty is the sauce of memory, the boy who learns with the greatest difficulty will remember with the greatest tenacity ; — in other words, the acquisitions of a dunce will be greater and more important than those of a clever boy. Where is the love of difficulty to end ? Why not leave a boy to compose his own dictionary and grammar ? It is not what is done for a boy, but what he does for himself, that is of any importance. Are there difficulties enough in the old method of acquiring languages ? Would it be better if the difficulties were doubled, and thirty years given to languages, instead of fifteen ? All these arguments presume the difficulty to be got over, and then the memory to be improved. But what if the difficulty is shrunk from ? What if it put an end to power instead of increasing it ; and extinguish, instead of exciting, application ? And when these effects are produced, you not only preclude all hopes of learning, or language, but you put an end for ever to all literary habits, and to all improvements from study. The boy who is lexicon-struck in early youth looks upon all books afterwards with horror, and goes over to the blockheads. Every boy would be pleased with books, and pleased with school, and be glad to forward the views of his parents, and obtain the praise of his master, if he found it possible to make tolerably easy progress ; but he is driven to absolute despair by gerunds, and wishes himself dead ! Progress is pleasure—activity is pleasure. It is impossible for a boy not to make progress, and not to be active, in the Hamiltonian method ; and this pleasing state of mind we contend to be more favourable to memory, than the languid jaded spirit which much commerce with lexicons never fails to produce.

Translations are objected to in schools justly enough, when they are paraphrases and not translations. It is impossible, from a paraphrase or very loose translation, to make any useful progress — they retard rather than accelerate a knowledge of the language to be acquired, and are the principal causes of the discredit into which translations have been brought, as instruments of education.

Infandum Regina jubes renovare dolorem,
Regina, jubes renovare dolorem infandum.

Oh ! Queen, thou orderest to renew grief not to be spoken of.

Oh ! Queen, in pursuance of your commands, I enter upon the narrative of misfortunes almost too great for utterance.

The first of these translations leads us directly to the explication of a foreign language, as the latter insures a perfect ignorance of it.

It is difficult enough to introduce any useful novelty in education without enhancing its perils by needless and untenable paradox. Mr. Hamilton has made an assertion in his Preface to the Key of the Italian Gospel, which has no kind of foundation in fact, and which has afforded a conspicuous mark for the aim of his antagonists.

"I have said that each word is translated by its *one sole* undeviating meaning, assuming as an incontrovertible principle in all languages that, with very few exceptions, each word has one meaning only, and can usually be rendered correctly into another by one word only, which one word should serve for its representative at all times and on all occasions."

Now, it is probable that each word had one meaning only in its origin ; but metaphor and association are so busy with human speech, that the same word comes to serve in a vast variety of senses, and continues to do so long after the metaphors and associations which called it into this state of activity are buried in oblivion. Why may not *jubeo* be translated *order* as well as

command, or *dolorem* rendered *grief* as well as *sorrow?* Mr. Hamilton has expressed himself loosely; but he perhaps means no more than to say, that in school translations, the metaphysical meaning should never be adopted, when the word can be rendered by its primary signification. We shall allow him, however, to detail his own method of making the translation in question.

"Translations on the Hamiltonian system, according to which this book is translated, must not be confounded with translations made according to Locke, Clarke, Sterling, or even according to Dumarsais, Fremont, and a number of other Frenchmen, who have made what have been and are yet sometimes called *literal* and interlineal translations. The latter are, indeed, *interlineal*, but no *literal* translation had ever appeared in any language before those called Hamiltonian, that is, before my Gospel of St. John from the French, the Greek, and Latin Gospels published in London, and L'Hommond's Epitome of the Historia Sacra. These and these only were and are truly literal; that is to say, that every word is rendered in English by a corresponding part of speech; that the grammatical analysis of the phrase is never departed from; that the case of every noun, pronoun, adjective, or particle, and the mood, tense, and person of every verb, are accurately pointed out by appropriate and unchanging signs, so that a grammarian not understanding one word of Italian, would, on reading any part of the translation here given, be instantly able to parse it. In the translations above alluded to, an attempt is made to preserve the correctness of the language into which the different works are translated, but the wish to conciliate this correctness with a literal translation has only produced a barbarous and uncouth idiom, while it has in every case deceived the unlearned pupil by a translation altogether false and incorrect. Such translations may, indeed, give an idea of what is contained in the book translated, but they will not assist, or at least very little, in enabling the pupil to make out the exact meaning of each word, which is the principal object of Hamiltonian translations. The reader will understand this better by an illustration: A gentleman has lately given a translation of Juvenal according to the plan of the above mentioned authors, beginning with the words *semper ego*, which he joins and translates, 'shall I always be' —if his intention were to teach Latin words, he might as well have said, 'shall I always eat beef-steaks?'—True, there is nothing about beef-steaks in *semper ego*, but neither is there about 'shall be:' the whole translation is on the same plan, that is to say, that there is not one line of it correct,—I had almost said one word, on which the pupil can rely, as the exact equivalent in English of the Latin word above it.—Not so the translation here given.

"As the object of the author has been that the pupil should know every word as well as he knows it himself, he has uniformly given it the one sole, precise, meaning which it has in our language, sacrificing everywhere the beauty, the idiom, and the correctness of the English language to the original, in order to show the perfect idiom, phraseology, and picture of that original as in a glass. So far is this carried, that where the English language can express the precise meaning of the Italian phrase only by a barbarism, this barbarism is employed without scruple—as thus:—'e le tenebre non l'hanno ammessa.'—Here the word *tenebre* being plural, if you translate it darkness, you not only give a false translation of the word itself, which is used by the Italians in the plural number, but, what is much more important, you lead the pupil into an error about its government, it being the nominative case to *hanno*, which is the third person plural; it is therefore translated not darkness but darknesses."

To make these keys perfect, we rather think there should be a free translation added to the literal one. Not a paraphrase, but only so free as to avoid any awkward or barbarous expression. The comparison between the free and the literal translation would immediately show to young people the peculiarities of the language in which they were engaged.

Literal translation or key—*Oh! Queen, thou orderest to renew grief not to be spoken of.*

Free,—"Oh! Queen, thou orderest me to renew my grief, too great for utterance."

The want of this accompanying free translation is not felt in keys of the Scriptures, because, in fact, the English Bible is a free translation, great part of which the scholar remembers. But in a work entirely unknown, of which a key was given, as full of awkward and barbarous expressions as a

key certainly ought to be, a scholar might be sometimes puzzled to arrive at the real sense. We say as full of awkward and barbarous expressions as it ought to be, because we thoroughly approve of Mr. Hamilton's plan, of always sacrificing English and elegance to sense, when they cannot be united in the key. We are rather sorry Mr. Hamilton's first essay has been in a translation of the Scriptures, because every child is so familiar with them, that it may be difficult to determine whether the apparent progress is ancient recollection or recent attainment; and because the Scriptures are so full of Hebraisms and Syriacisms, and the language so different from that of Greek authors, that it does not secure a knowledge of the language equivalent to the time employed upon it.

The keys hitherto published by Mr. Hamilton are the Greek, Latin, French, Italian, and German keys to the Gospel of St. John, Perrin's Fables, Latin Historia Sacra, Latin, French, and Italian Grammar and Studia Metrica. One of the difficulties under which the system is labouring, is a want of more Keys. Some of the best Greek and Roman classics should be immediately published, with Keys, and by very good scholars. We shall now lay before our readers an extract from one of the public papers respecting the progress made in the Hamiltonian schools.

Extract from the Morning Chronicle of Wednesday, November 16th, 1825.—"*Hamiltonian System.*—We yesterday were present at an examination of eight lads who have been under Mr. Hamilton since some time in the month of May last, with a view to ascertain the efficacy of his system in communicating a knowledge of languages. These eight lads, all of them between the ages of twelve and fourteen, are the children of poor people, who, when they were first placed under Mr. Hamilton, possessed no other instruction than common reading and writing. They were obtained from a common country school, through the interposition of a Member of Parliament, who takes an active part in promoting charity schools throughout the country; and the choice was determined by the consent of the parents, and not by the cleverness of the boys.

"They have been employed in learning Latin, French, and latterly Italian; and yesterday they were examined by several distinguished individuals, among whom we recognised John Smith, Esq. M.P.; G. Smith, Esq. M.P.; Mr. J. Mill, the historian of British India; Major Camac; Major Thompson; Mr. Cowell, &c. &c. They first read different portions of the Gospel of St. John in Latin, and Cæsar's Commentaries, selected by the visitors. The translation was executed with an ease which it would be in vain to expect in any of the boys who attend our common schools, even in their third or fourth year; and proved, that the principle of exciting the attention of boys to the utmost, during the process by which the meaning of the words is fixed in their memory, had given them a great familiarity with so much of the language as is contained in the books above alluded to. Their knowledge of the parts of speech was respectable, but not so remarkable; as the Hamiltonian system follows the natural mode of acquiring language, and only employs the boys in analysing, when they have already attained a certain familiarity with any language.

"The same experiments were repeated in French and Italian with the same success, and, upon the whole, we cannot but think the success has been complete. It is impossible to conceive a more impartial mode of putting any system to the test, than to make such an experiment on the children of our peasantry."

Into the truth of this statement we have personally inquired, and it seems to us to have fallen short of the facts from the laudable fear of overstating them. The lads selected for the experiment were parish boys of the most ordinary description, reading English worse than Cumberland curates, and totally ignorant of the rudiments of any other language. They were purposely selected for the experiment by a gentleman who defrayed its expense, and who had the strongest desire to put strictly to the test the efficacy of the Hamiltonian system. The experiment was begun the middle of May, 1825, and concluded on the day of November in the same year mentioned in the extract, exactly six months after. The Latin books set before them were the Gospel of St. John, and parts of Cæsar's Commentaries. Some Italian book or books (what we

know not), and a selection of French histories. The visitors put the boys on where they pleased, and the translation was (as the reporter says) executed with an ease which it would be vain to expect in any of the boys who attend our common schools, even in their third or fourth year.*

From experiments and observations which have fallen under our own notice, we do not scruple to make the following assertions. If there were keys to the four Gospels, as there is to that of St. John, any boy or girl of thirteen years of age, and of moderate capacity, studying four hours a day, and beginning with an utter ignorance even of the Greek character, would learn to construe the four Gospels with the most perfect and scrupulous accuracy in six weeks. Some children, utterly ignorant of French or Italian, would learn to construe the four Gospels in either of these languages in three weeks; the Latin in four weeks, the German, in five weeks. We believe they would do it in a class; but, not to run any risks, we will presume a master to attend upon one student alone for these periods. We assign a master principally because the application of a solitary boy at that age could not be depended upon; but if the sedulity of the child were certain, he would do it nearly as well alone. A greater time is allowed for German and Greek, on account of the novelty of the character. A person of mature habits, eager and energetic in his pursuits, and reading seven or eight hours per day, might, though utterly ignorant of a letter of Greek, learn to construe the four Gospels, with the most punctilious accuracy, in three weeks, by the Key alone. These assertions we make, not of the Gospels alone, but of any tolerably easy book of the same extent. We mean to be very accurate; but suppose we are wrong — add 10, 20, 30 per cent. to the time — an average boy of thirteen, in an average school, cannot construe the four Gospels in two years from the time of his beginning the language.

All persons would be glad to read a foreign language, but all persons do not want the same scrupulous and comprehensive knowledge of grammar which a great Latin scholar possesses. Many persons may, and do, derive great pleasure and instruction from French, German, and Italian books, who can neither speak nor write these languages — who know that certain terminations, when they see them, signify present or past time, but who, if they wished to signify present or past time, could not recall these terminations. For many purposes and objects, therefore, very little grammar is wanting.

The Hamiltonian method begins with what all persons want — a facility of construing, and leaves every scholar to become afterwards as profound in grammar as he (or those who educate him) may choose; whereas the old method aims at making all more profound grammarians than three fourths wish to be, or than nineteen twentieths *can* be. One of the enormous follies of the enormously foolish education in England is, that all young men — dukes, foxhunters, and merchants — are educated as if they were to keep a school, and serve a curacy; while scarcely an hour in the Hamiltonian education is lost for any variety of life. A grocer may learn enough of Latin to taste the sweets of Virgil; a cavalry officer may read and understand Homer, without knowing that τίημι comes from εω with a smooth breathing, and that it is formed by an improper reduplication. In the meantime, there is nothing in that education which prevents a scholar from knowing (if he wishes to know) what Greek compounds draw back their accents. He may trace verbs in ἴμι from polysyllables in ἴω, or derive endless glory from marking down derivatives in πτω, changing the ε of their primitives into iota.

Thus, in the Hamiltonian method, a good deal of grammar necessarily impresses itself upon the mind (*che-*

* We have left with the bookseller the names of two gentlemen who have verified this account to us, and who were present at the experiment. Their names will at once put an end to all scepticism as to the fact. Two more candid and enlightened judges could not be found.

min faisant), as it does in the vernacular tongue, without any rule at all, and merely by habit. How is it possible to read many Latin Keys, for instance, without remarking, willingly or unwillingly, that the first persons of verbs end in *o*, the second in *s*, the third in *t*?—that the same adjective ends in *us* or *a*, accordingly as the connected substantive is masculine or feminine, and other such gross and common rules? An Englishman who means to say, *I will go to London*, does not say, *I could go to London*. He never read a word of grammar in his life; but he has learnt by habit, that the word *go* signifies to proceed or set forth, and by the same habit he learns that future intentions are expressed by *I will;* and by the same habit the Hamiltonian pupil, reading over and comprehending twenty times more words and phrases than the pupil of the ancient system, insensibly but infallibly fixes upon his mind many rules of grammar. We are far from meaning to say, that the grammar thus acquired will be sufficiently accurate for a first-rate Latin and Greek scholar; but there is no reason why a young person arriving at this distinction, and educated in the Hamiltonian system, may not carry the study of grammar to any degree of minuteness and accuracy. The only difference is, that he begins grammar as a study, after he has made a considerable progress in the language, and not before — a very important feature in the Hamiltonian system, and a very great improvement in the education of children.

The imperfections of the old system proceed in a great measure from a bad and improvident accumulation of difficulties, which must all perhaps, though in a less degree, at one time or another be encountered, but which may be, and in the Hamiltonian system are, much more wisely distributed. A boy who sits down to Greek with lexicon and grammar, has to master an unknown character of an unknown language—to look out words in a lexicon, in the use of which he is inexpert—to guess, by many trials, in which of the numerous senses detailed in the lexicon he is to use the word—to attend to the inflexions of cases and tense—to become acquainted with the syntax of the language — and to become acquainted with these inflexions and this syntax from books written in foreign languages, and full of the most absurd and barbarous terms, and this at the tenderest age, when the mind is utterly unfit to grapple with any great difficulty; and the boy, who revolts at all this folly and absurdity, is set down for a dunce, and must go into a marching regiment, or on board a man of war! The Hamiltonian pupil has his word looked out for him, its proper sense ascertained, the case of the substantive, the inflexions of the verb pointed out, and the syntaxical arrangement placed before his eyes. Where, then, is he to encounter these difficulties? Does he hope to escape them entirely? Certainly not, if it be his purpose to become a great scholar; but he will enter upon them when the character is familiar to his eye — when a great number of Greek words are familiar to his eye and ear — when he has practically mastered a great deal of grammar — when the terminations of verbs convey to him different modifications of time, the terminations of substantives different varieties of circumstance — when the rules of grammar, in short, are a confirmation of previous observation, not an irksome multitude of directions, heaped up without any opportunity of immediate application.

The real way of learning a dead language, is to imitate, as much as possible, the method in which a living language is naturally learnt. When do we ever find a well-educated Englishman or Frenchman embarrassed by an ignorance of the grammar of their respective languages? They first learn it practically and unerringly; and then, if they choose to look back and smile at the idea of having proceeded by a number of rules without knowing one of them by heart, or being conscious that they had any rule at all, this is a philosophical amusement: but who ever thinks of

learning the grammar of their own tongue before they are very good grammarians? Let us hear what Mr. Locke says upon this subject: — "If grammar ought to be taught at any time, it must be to one that can speak the language already; how else can he be taught the grammar of it? This at least is evident, from the practice of the wise and learned nations amongst the ancients. They made it a part of education to cultivate their own, not foreign languages. The Greeks counted all other nations barbarous, and had a contempt for their languages. And though the Greek learning grew in credit amongst the Romans towards the end of their commonwealth, yet it was the Roman tongue that was made the study of their youth: their own language they were to make use of, and therefore it was their own language they were instructed and exercised in.

"But, more particularly, to determine the proper season for grammar, I do not see how it can reasonably be made any one's study, but as an introduction to rhetoric. When it is thought time to put any one upon the care of polishing his tongue, and of speaking better than the illiterate, then is the time for him to be instructed in the rules of grammar, and not before. For grammar being to teach men not to speak, but to speak correctly, and according to the exact rules of the tongue, which is one part of elegancy, there is little use of the one to him that has no need of the other. Where rhetoric is not necessary, grammar may be spared. I know not why any one should waste his time, and beat his head about the Latin grammar, who does not intend to be a critic or make speeches, and write despatches in it. When any one finds in himself a necessity or disposition to study any foreign language to the bottom, and to be nicely exact in the knowledge of it, it will be time enough to take a grammatical survey of it. If his use of it be only to understand some books writ in it, without a critical knowledge of the tongue itself, reading alone, as I have said, will attain that end, without charging the mind with the multiplied rules and intricacies of grammar."— (*Locke on Education*, p. 78. folio.)

In the Eton Grammar, the following very plain and elementary information is conveyed to young gentlemen utterly ignorant of every syllable of the language: —

"Nomina anomala quæ contrahuntur sunt, Ὁλοπαθῆ, quæ contrahuntur in omnibus, ut γοος γοῦς, &c. Ὁλιγοπαθῆ, quæ in paucioribus casibus contrahuntur, ut substantiva Barytonia in ρ. Imparyllatria in ουρ," &c. &c.

From the Westminster Grammar we make the following extract—and some thousand rules, conveyed in poetry of equal merit, must be fixed upon the mind of the youthful Grecian, before he advances into the interior of the language: —

"ω finis thematis finis utriusque futuri est
Post liquidam in primo, vel in unoquoque secundo,
ω circumflexum est. Ante ω finale character
Explicitus σε primi est implicitusque futuri
ω itaque in quo σ quasi plexum est solitu in σω."

Westminster Greek Grammar, 1814.

Such are the easy initiations of our present methods of teaching. The Hamiltonian system, on the other hand, 1. teaches an unknown tongue by the closest interlinear translation, instead of leaving a boy to explore his way by the lexicon or dictionary. 2. It postpones the study of grammar till a considerable progress has been made in the language, and a great degree of practical grammar has been acquired. 3. It substitutes the cheerfulness and competition of the Lancasterian system for the dull solitude of the dictionary. By these means, a boy finds he is making a progress, and learning something from the very beginning. He is not overwhelmed with the first appearance of insuperable difficulties; he receives some little pay from the first moment of his apprenticeship, and is not compelled to wait for remuneration till he is out of his time. The student having acquired the great art of understanding the

sense of what is written in another tongue, may go into the study of the language as deeply and as extensively as he pleases. The old system aims at beginning with a depth and accuracy which many men never will want, which disgusts many from arriving even at moderate attainments, and is a less easy, and not more certain road to a profound skill in languages, than if attention to grammar had been deferred to a later period.

In fine, we are strongly persuaded, that the time being given, this system will make better scholars; and the degree of scholarship being given, a much shorter time will be needed. If there be any truth in this, it will make Mr. Hamilton one of the most useful men of his age; for if there be anything which fills reflecting men with melancholy and regret, it is the waste of mortal time, parental money, and puerile happiness, in the present method of pursuing Latin and Greek.

COUNSEL FOR PRISONERS.

(E. Review, 1826.)

Stockton on the Practice of not allowing Counsel for Prisoners accused of Felony. 8vo. London. 1826.

On the sixth of April, 1824, Mr. George Lamb (a gentleman who is always the advocate of whatever is honest and liberal) presented the following petition from several jurymen in the habit of serving on juries at the Old Bailey:—

"That your petitioners, fully sensible of the invaluable privilege of Jury trials, and desirous of seeing them as complete as human institutions will admit, feel it their duty to draw the attention of the House to the restrictions imposed on the prisoner's counsel, which, they humbly conceive, have strong claims to a legislative remedy. With every disposition to decide justly, the petitioners have found, by experience, in the course of their attendances as jurymen in the Old Bailey, that the opening statements for the prosecution too frequently leave an impression more unfavourable to the prisoner at the bar, than the evidence of itself could have produced; and it has always sounded harsh to the petitioners to hear it announced from the bench, that the counsel, to whom the prisoner has committed his defence, cannot be permitted to address the jury in his behalf, nor reply to the charges which have, or have not, been substantiated by the witnesses. The petitioners have felt their situation peculiarly painful and embarrassing when the prisoner's faculties, perhaps surprised by such an intimation, are too much absorbed in the difficulties of his unhappy circumstances to admit of an effort towards his own justification, against the statements of the prosecutor's counsel, often unintentionally aggravated through zeal or misconception; and it is purely with a view to the attainment of impartial justice, that the petitioners humbly submit to the serious consideration of the House the expediency of allowing every accused person the full benefit of counsel, as in cases of misdemeanour, and according to the practice of the civil courts."

With the opinions so sensibly and properly expressed by these jurymen, we most cordially agree. We have before touched incidentally on this subject; but shall now give to it a more direct and fuller examination. We look upon it as a very great blot in our over-praised criminal code; and no effort of ours shall be wanting, from time to time, for its removal.

We have now the benefit of discussing these subjects under the government of a Home Secretary of State, whom we may (we believe) fairly call a wise, honest, and high-principled man — as he appears to us, without wishing for innovation, or having any itch for it, not to be afraid of innovation*, when it is gradual and well considered. He is, indeed, almost the only person we remember in his station, who has not considered sound sense to consist in the rejection of every improvement, and loyalty to be proved by the defence of every accidental, imperfect, or superannuated institution.

If this petition of jurymen be a real *bonâ fide* petition, not the result of soli-

* We must always except the Catholic question. Mr. Peel's opinions on this subject (giving him credit for sincerity) have always been a subject of real surprise to us. It must surely be some mistake between the Right Honourable Gentleman and his chaplain! They have been travelling together, and some of the parson's notions have been put up in Mr. Peel's head by mistake. We yet hope he will return them to their rightful owner.

citation — and we have no reason to doubt it—it is a warning which the Legislature cannot neglect, if it mean to avoid the disgrace of seeing the lower and middle orders of mankind making laws for themselves, which the Government is at length compelled to adopt as measures of their own. The Judges and the Parliament would have gone on to this day, hanging, by wholesale, for the forgeries of bank notes, if juries had not become weary of the continual butchery, and resolved to acquit. The proper execution of laws must always depend, in great measure, upon public opinion; and it is undoubtedly most discreditable to any men intrusted with power, when the governed turn round upon their governors, and say, "Your laws are so cruel, or so foolish, we can not, and *will not*, act upon them."

The particular improvement, of allowing counsel to those who are accused of felony, is so far from being unnecessary, from any extraordinary indulgence shown to English prisoners, that we really cannot help suspecting, that not a year elapses in which many innocent persons are not found guilty. How is it possible, indeed, that it can be otherwise? There are seventy or eighty persons to be tried for various offences at the Assizes, who have lain in prison for some months; and fifty of whom, perhaps, are of the lowest order of the people, without friends in any better condition than themselves, and without one single penny to employ in their defence. How are they to obtain witnesses? No attorney can be employed — no subpœna can be taken out; the witnesses are fifty miles off, perhaps—totally uninstructed — living from hand to mouth — utterly unable to give up their daily occupation, to pay for their journey, or for their support when arrived at the town of trial — and, if they could get there, not knowing where to go, or what to do. It is impossible but that a human being, in such a helpless situation, must be found guilty; for as he cannot give evidence for himself, and has not a penny to fetch those who can give it for him, any story told against him must be taken for true (however false); since it is impossible for the poor wretch to contradict it. A brother or a sister may come — and support every suffering and privation themselves in coming; but the prisoner cannot often have such claims upon the persons who have witnessed the transaction, nor any other claims but those which an unjustly accused person has upon those whose testimony can exculpate him — and who probably must starve themselves and their families to do it. It is true, a case of life and death will rouse the poorest persons, every now and then, to extraordinary exertions, and they may tramp through mud and dirt to the Assize town to save a life — though even this effort is precarious enough: but imprisonment, hard labour, or transportation, appeal less forcibly than death — and would often appeal for evidence in vain, to the feeble and limited resources of extreme poverty. It is not that a great proportion of those accused are not guilty—but that some are not—and are utterly without means of establishing their innocence. We do not believe they are often accused from wilful and corrupt perjury; but the prosecutor is himself mistaken — the crime has been committed; and in his thirst for vengeance, he has got hold of the wrong man. The wheat was stolen out of the barn; and, amidst many other collateral circumstances, the witnesses (paid and brought up by a wealthy prosecutor, who is repaid by the county) swear that they saw a man, very like the prisoner, with a sack of corn upon his shoulder, at an early hour of the morning, going from the barn in the direction of the prisoner's cottage! Here is one link, and a very material link, of a long chain of circumstantial evidence. Judge and jury must give it weight, till it is contradicted. In fact, the prisoner did not steal the corn; he was, to be sure, out of his cottage at the same hour—and that also is proved — but travelling in a totally different direction — and was seen to be so travelling by a stage coachman passing by, and by a market gardener. An attorney with money in

his pocket, whom every moment of such employ made richer by six-and-eightpence, would have had the two witnesses ready, and at rack and manger, from the first day of the assize; and the innocence of the prisoner would have been established: but by what possible means is the destitute ignorant wretch himself to find or to produce such witnesses? or how can the most humane jury, and the most acute judge, refuse to consider him as guilty, till his witnesses *are* produced? We have not the slightest disposition to exaggerate, and on the contrary, should be extremely pleased to be convinced that our apprehensions were unfounded: but we have often felt extreme pain at the hopeless and unprotected state of prisoners; and we cannot find any answer to our suspicions, or discover any means by which this perversion of justice, under the present state of the law, can be prevented from taking place. Against the prisoner are arrayed all the resources of an angry prosecutor, who has certainly (let who will be the culprit) suffered a serious injury. He has his hand, too, in the public purse; for he prosecutes at the expense of the county. He cannot even relent; for the magistrate has bound him over to indict. His witnesses cannot fail him; for they are all bound over by the same magistrate to give evidence. He is out of prison, too, and can exert himself.

The prisoner, on the other hand, comes into Court, squalid and depressed from long confinement — utterly unable to tell his own story for want of words and want of confidence, and as unable to produce evidence for want of money. His fate accordingly is obvious; — and that there are many innocent men punished every year, for crimes they have not committed, appears to us to be extremely probable. It is indeed, scarcely possible it should be otherwise; and, as if to prove the fact, every now and then, a case of this kind *is* detected. Some circumstances come to light between sentence and execution; immense exertions are made by humane men; time is gained, and the innocence of the condemned person completely established. In Elizabeth Caning's case, two women were capitally convicted, ordered for execution — and at last found innocent, and respited. Such, too, was the case of the men who were sentenced, ten years ago, for the robbery of Lord Cowper's steward. "I have myself (says Mr. Scarlett) *often* seen persons I thought innocent convicted, and the guilty escape, for want of some acute and intelligent counsel to show the bearings of the different circumstances on the conduct and situation of the prisoner."—(*House of Commons Debates, April 25th*, 1826.) We are delighted to see, in this last debate, both Mr. Brougham and Mr. Scarlett profess themselves friendly to Mr. Lamb's motion.

But in how many cases has the injustice proceeded without any suspicion being excited? and even if we could reckon upon men being watchful in capital cases, where life is concerned, we are afraid it is in such cases alone that they ever besiege the Secretary of State, and compel his attention. We never remember any such interference to save a man unjustly condemned to the hulks or the tread-mill; and yet there are certainly more condemnations of these minor punishments than to the gallows: but then it is all one — who knows or cares about it? If Harrison or Johnson has been condemned, after regular trial by jury, to six months' tread-mill, because Harrison and Johnson were without a penny to procure evidence — who knows or cares about Harrison or Johnson? how can they make themselves heard? or in what way can they obtain redress? It worries rich and comfortable people to hear the humanity of our penal laws called in question. There is a talk of a society for employing discharged prisoners: might not something be effected by a society instituted for the purpose of providing to poor prisoners a proper defence, and a due attendance of witnesses? But we must hasten on from this disgraceful neglect of poor prisoners, to the particular subject of complaint we have proposed to ourselves.

The proposition is, *That the prisoner accused of felony ought to have the same power of selecting counsel to speak for him as he has in cases of treason and misdemeanour, and as defendants have in all civil actions.*

Nothing can be done in any discussion upon any point of law in England, without quoting Mr. Justice Blackstone. Mr. Justice Blackstone, we believe, generally wrote his Commentaries late in the evening, with a bottle of wine before him; and little did he think, as each sentence fell from the glass and pen, of the immense influence it might hereafter exercise upon the laws and usages of his country. "It is," says this favourite writer, "not at all of a piece with the rest of the humane treatment of prisoners by the English law; for upon what face of reason can that assistance be denied to save the life of a man, which yet is allowed him in prosecutions for every petty trespass?" Nor, indeed, strictly speaking, is it a part of our ancient law; for the Mirror, having observed the necessity of counsel in civil suits, who know how to forward and defend the cause by the rules of law and customs of the realm, immediately subjoins, "and more necessary are they for defence upon indictment and appeals of felony, than upon any other venial crimes." To the authority of Blackstone may be added that of Sir John Hall, in Hollis's case; of Sir Robert Atkyns, in Lord Russell's case; and of Sir Bartholomew Shower, in the arguments for a New Bill of Rights, in 1682. "In the name of God," says this judge, "what harm can accrue to the public in general, or to any man in particular, that, in cases of State-treason, counsel should not be allowed to the accused? What rule of justice is there to warrant its denial, when, in a civil case of a halfpenny cake, he may plead either by himself or by his advocate? That the Court is counsel for the prisoner can be no effectual reason; for so they are for each party, that right may be done." —(*Somers' Tracts*, vol. ii. p. 568.) In the trial of Thomas Rosewell, a dissenting clergyman, for high treason, in 1684, *Judge Jeffries*, in summing up, confessed to the jury, "that he thought it a hard case, that a man should have counsel to defend himself for a twopenny trespass, and his witnesses be examined upon oath; but if he stole, committed murder or felony, nay, high treason, where life, estate, honour, and all were concerned, that he should neither have counsel, nor have his witnesses examined upon oath." —(*Howell's State Trials*, vol. x. p. 207.)

There have been two capital errors in the criminal codes of feudal Europe, from which a great variety of mistake and injustice have proceeded: the one, a disposition to confound accusation with guilt; the other, to mistake a defence of prisoners accused by the Crown, for disloyalty and disaffection to the Crown; and from these errors our own code has been slowly and gradually recovering, by all those struggles and exertions which it always costs to remove *folly sanctioned by antiquity.* In the early periods of our history, the accused person could call no evidence:— then for a long time, his evidence against the King could not be examined upon oath; consequently, he might as well have produced none, as all the evidence against him was upon oath. Till the reign of Anne, no one accused of felony could produce witnesses upon oath; and the old practice was vindicated, in opposition to the new one, introduced under the statute of that day, on the grounds of humanity and tenderness to the prisoner! because, as his witnesses were not restricted by an oath, they were at liberty to indulge in simple falsehood as much as they pleased;—so argued the blessed defenders of nonsense in those days. Then it was ruled to be indecent and improper that counsel should be employed against the Crown; and, therefore, the prisoner accused of treason could have no counsel. In like manner, a party accused of felony could have no counsel to assist him in the trial. Counsel might indeed stay in the court, but apart from the prisoner, with whom they could have no communication. They were not allowed to put any

question, or to suggest any doubtful point of law; but if the prisoner (likely to be a weak unlettered man) could himself suggest any doubt in matter of law, the Court determined first if the question of law should be entertained, and then assigned counsel to argue it. In those times, too, the jury were punishable if they gave a false verdict against the King, but were *not* punishable if they gave a false verdict against the prisoner. The preamble of the Act of 1696 runs thus:—"Whereas it is expedient that persons charged with high treason should make a full and sufficient defence." Might it not be altered to *persons charged with any species or degree of crime?* All these errors have given way to the force of truth, and to the power of common sense and common humanity—the Attorney and Solicitor General, for the time being, always protesting against each alteration, and regularly and officially prophesying the utter destruction of the whole jurisprudence of Great Britain. There is no man now alive perhaps, so utterly foolish, as to propose, that prisoners should be prevented from producing evidence upon oath, and being heard by their counsel in cases of high treason; and yet it cost a struggle for *seven* sessions to get this measure through the two houses of Parliament. But mankind are much like the children they beget—they always make wry faces at what is to do them good; and it is necessary sometimes to hold the nose, and force the medicine down the throat. They enjoy the health and vigour consequent upon the medicine; but cuff the doctor, and sputter at his stuff!

A most absurd argument was advanced in the honourable House, that the practice of employing counsel would be such an expense to the prisoner!—just as if anything was so expensive as being hanged! What a fine topic for the ordinary! "You are going" (says that exquisite divine) "to be hanged to-morrow, it is true, but consider what a sum you have saved! Mr. Scarlett or Mr. Brougham might certainly have presented arguments to the jury, which would have insured your acquittal; but do you forget that gentlemen of their eminence must be recompensed by large fees, and that, if your life had been saved, you would actually have been out of pocket above 20*l.*? You will now die with the consciousness of having obeyed the dictates of a wise economy; and with a grateful reverence for the laws of your country, which prevents you from running into such unbounded expense—so let us now go to prayers."

It is ludicrous enough to recollect, when the employment of counsel is objected to on account of the expense to the prisoner, that the same merciful law, which, to save the prisoner's money, has *denied* him counsel, and produced his conviction, seizes upon all his savings the moment he is convicted.

Of all false and foolish *dicta*, the most trite and the most absurd is that which asserts that the Judge is counsel for the prisoner. We do not hesitate to say that this is merely an unmeaning phrase, invented to defend a pernicious abuse. The Judge *cannot* be counsel for the prisoner, *ought not* to be counsel for the prisoner, never *is* counsel for the prisoner. To force an ignorant man into a court of justice, and to tell him that the Judge is his counsel, appears to us quite as foolish as to set a hungry man down to his meals, and to tell him that the table was his dinner. In the first place, a counsel should always have private and previous communication with the prisoner, which the Judge, of course, cannot have. The prisoner reveals to his counsel how far he is guilty, or he is not; states to him all the circumstances of his case—and might often enable his advocate, if his advocate were allowed to speak, to explain a long string of circumstantial evidence in a manner favourable to the innocence of his client. Of all these advantages, the Judge, if he had every disposition to befriend the prisoner, is of course deprived. Something occurs to a prisoner in the course of the cause; he suggests it in a whisper to his counsel, doubtful if it is a wise point to

urge or not. His counsel thinks it of importance, and would urge it, if his mouth were not shut. Can a prisoner have this secret communication with a Judge, and take his advice, whether or not he, the Judge, shall mention it to the jury? The counsel has (after all the evidence has been given) a bad opinion of his client's case; but he suppresses that opinion; and it is duty to do so. He is not to decide; that is the province of the jury; and in spite of his own opinion, his client may be innocent. He is brought there (or would be brought there if the privilege of speech were allowed) for the express purpose of saying all that could be said on one side of the question. He is a weight in *one* scale, and some one else holds the balance. This is the way in which truth is elicited in civil, and would be in criminal cases. But does *the Judge* ever assume the appearance of believing a prisoner to be innocent whom he thinks to be guilty? If the prisoner advances inconclusive or weak arguments, does not the Judge say they are weak and inconclusive, and does he not often sum up against his own client? How then is he counsel for the prisoner? If the counsel for the prisoner were to see a strong point, which the counsel for the prosecution had missed, would he supply the deficiency of his antagonist, and urge what had been neglected to be urged? But is it not the imperious duty of the Judge to do so? How then can these two functionaries stand in the same relation to the prisoner? In fact, the only meaning of the phrase is this, that the Judge will not suffer any undue advantage to be taken of the ignorance and helplessness of the prisoner—that he will point out any evidence or circumstance in his favour—and see that equal justice is done to both parties. But in this sense he is as much the counsel of the prosecutor as of the prisoner. This is all the Judge can do, or even pretends to do; but he can have no previous communication with the prisoner—he can have no confidential communication in court with the prisoner before he sums up; he cannot fling the whole weight of his understanding into the opposite scale against the counsel for the prosecution, and produce that collision of faculties, which, in all other cases but those of felony, is supposed to be the happiest method of arriving at truth. Baron Garrow, in his charge to the grand jury at Exeter, on the 16th of August, 1824, thus expressed his opinion of a Judge being counsel for the prisoner:—"It has been said, and truly said, that in criminal courts, Judges were counsel for the prisoners. So undoubtedly they were, as far as they could to prevent undue prejudice, to guard against improper influence being excited against prisoners; but it was impossible for them to go further than this; for they could not suggest the course of defence prisoners ought to pursue; for Judges only saw the depositions so short a time before the accused appeared at the bar of their country, that it was quite impossible for them to act fully in that capacity." The learned Baron might have added, that it would be more correct to call the Judge counsel for the prosecution; for his only previous instructions were the depositions for the prosecution, from which, in the absence of counsel, he examined the evidence against the prisoner. On the prisoner's behalf he had no instructions at all.

Can anything, then, be more flagrantly and scandalously unjust, than, in a long case of circumstantial evidence, to refuse to a prisoner the benefit of counsel? A foot-mark, a word, a sound, a tool dropped, all gave birth to the most ingenious inferences; and the counsel for the prosecution is so far from being blamable for entering into all these things, that they are all essential to the detection of guilt, and they are all links of a long and intricate chain: but if a close examination into, and a logical statement of, all these circumstances be necessary for the establishment of guilt, is not the same closeness of reasoning, and the same logical statement necessary for the establishment of innocence? If justice cannot be done to society without the intervention of a practised and ingenious mind, who may connect all these

links together, and make them clear to the apprehension of a jury, *can* justice be done to the prisoner, unless similar practice and similar ingenuity are employed to detect the flaws of the chain, and to point out the disconnection of the circumstances ?

Is there any one gentleman in the House of Commons, who, in yielding his vote to this paltry and perilous fallacy of the Judge being counsel for the prisoner, does not feel, that, were he himself a criminal, he would prefer almost any counsel at the bar, to the tender mercies of the Judge ? How strange that any man who could make his election would eagerly and diligently surrender this exquisite privilege, and addict himself to the perilous practice of giving fees to counsel ! Nor let us forget, in considering Judges as counsel for the prisoner, that there have been such men as Chief Justice Jeffries, Mr. Justice Page, and Mr. Justice Alybone, and that, in bad times, such men may reappear. "If you do not allow me counsel, my Lords (says Lord Lovat), it is impossible for me to make any defence, by reason of my infirmity. I do not see, I do not hear. I come up to the bar at the hazard of my life. I have fainted several times ; I have been up so early, ever since four o'clock this morning. I therefore ask for assistance ; and if you do not allow me counsel, or such aid as is necessary, it will be impossible for me to make any defence at all." Though Lord Lovat's guilt was evident, yet the managers of the impeachment felt so strongly the injustice which was done, that, by the hands of Sir W. Young, the chief manager, a bill was brought into Parliament to allow counsel to persons impeached by that House, which was not previously the case ; so that the evil is already done away with, in a great measure, to persons of rank: it so happens in legislation, when a gentleman suffers, public attention is awakened to the evil of laws. Every man who makes laws says, "This may be my case :" but it requires the repeated efforts of humane men, or, as Mr. North calls them dilettanti philosophers, to awaken the attention of law-makers to evils from which they are themselves exempt. We do not say this to make the leaders of mankind unpopular, but to rouse their earnest attention in cases where the poor only are concerned, and where neither good nor evil can happen to themselves.

A great stress is laid upon the moderation of the opening counsel ; that is, he does not conjure the farmers in the jury-box, by the love which they bear to their children—he does not declaim upon blood-guiltiness—he does not describe the death of Abel by Cain, the first murderer—he does not describe scattered brains, ghastly wounds, pale features, and hair clotted with gore —he does not do a thousand things, which are not in English taste, and which it would be very foolish and very vulgar to do. We readily allow all this. But yet, if it be a cause of importance, it is essentially necessary to our counsellor's reputation that this man should be hung ! And accordingly, with a very calm voice, and composed manner, and with many expressions of candour, he sets himself to comment astutely upon the circumstances. Distant events are immediately connected ; meaning is given to insignificant facts ; new motives are ascribed to innocent actions ; farmer gives way after farmer in the jury-box ; and a rope of eloquence is woven round the prisoner's neck ! Every one is delighted with the talents of the advocate ; and, because there has been no noise, no violent action, and no consequent perspiration, he is praised for his candour and forbearance, and the lenity of our laws is the theme of universal approbation. In the meantime, the speech-maker and the prisoner know better.

We should be glad to know of any one nation in the world, taxed by kings, or even imagined by poets (except the English), who have refused to prisoners the benefit of counsel. Why is the voice of humanity heard everywhere else, and disregarded here ? In Scotland, the accused have not only counsel to speak for them, but a copy of the indictment, and a list of the witnesses. In France, in the Netherlands, in the

whole of Europe, counsel are allotted as a matter of course. Everywhere else but here, accusation is considered as unfavourable to the exercise of human faculties. It is admitted to be that crisis in which, above all others, an unhappy man wants the aid of eloquence, wisdom, and coolness. In France, the Napoleon Code has provided not only that counsel should be allowed to the prisoner, but that, as with us in Scotland, his counsel should have the last word.

It is a most affecting moment in a court of justice when the evidence has all been heard, and the Judge asks the prisoner what he has to say in his defence. The prisoner, who has (by great exertions, perhaps of his friends) saved up money enough to procure counsel, says to the Judge, "that he leaves his defence to his counsel." We have often blushed for English humanity to hear the reply. "Your counsel cannot speak for you, you must speak for yourself;" and this is the reply given to a poor girl of eighteen—to a foreigner—to a deaf man—to a stammerer—to the sick—to the feeble—to the old—to the most abject and ignorant of human beings! It is a reply, we must say, at which common sense and common feeling revolt:—for it is full of brutal cruelty, and of base inattention of those who make laws, to the happiness of those for whom laws were made. We wonder that any juryman can convict under such a shocking violation of all natural justice. The iron age of Clovis and Clottaire can produce no more atrocious violation of every good feeling, and every good principle. Can a sick man find strength and nerves to speak before a large assembly?—can an ignorant man find words?—can a low man find confidence? Is not he afraid of becoming an object of ridicule?—can he believe that his expressions will be understood? How often have we seen a poor wretch, struggling against the agonies of his spirit, and the rudeness of his conceptions, and his awe of better-dressed men and better-taught men, and the shame which the accusation has brought upon his head, and the sight of his parents and children gazing at him in the Court, for the last time, perhaps, and after a long absence! The mariner sinking in the wave does not want a helping hand more than does this poor wretch. But help is denied to all! Age cannot have it, nor ignorance, nor the modesty of women! One hard uncharitable rule silences the defenders of the wretched, in the worst of human evils; and at the bitterest of human moments, mercy is blotted out from the ways of men!

Suppose a crime to have been committed under the influence of insanity; is the insane man, now convalescent, to plead his own insanity?—to offer arguments to show that he must have been mad?—and, by the glimmerings of his returning reason, to prove that at a former period that same reason was utterly extinct? These are the cruel situations into which Judges and Courts of Justice are thrown by the present state of the law.

There is a Judge now upon the Bench, who never took away the life of a fellow-creature without shutting himself up alone, and giving the most profound attention to every circumstance of the case! and this solemn act he always premises with his own beautiful prayer to God, that he will enlighten him with his Divine Spirit in the exercise of this terrible privilege! Now, would it not be an immense satisfaction to this feeling and honourable magistrate, to be sure that every witness on the side of the prisoner had been heard, and that every argument which could be urged in his favour had been brought forward, by a man whose duty it was to see only on one side of the question, and whose interest and reputation were thoroughly embarked in this partial exertion? If a Judge fail to get at the truth, after these instruments of investigation are used, his failure must be attributed to the limited powers of man—not to the want of good inclination, or wise institutions. We are surprised that such a measure does not come into Parliament, with the strong recommendation of the Judges. It is surely better to be a day longer on the circuit, than to murder rapidly in ermine.

It is argued, that, among the various pleas for mercy that are offered, no prisoner has ever urged to the Secretary of State the disadvantage of having no counsel to plead for him; but a prisoner who dislikes to undergo his sentence naturally addresses to those who can reverse it such arguments only as will produce, in the opinion of the referee, a pleasing effect. He does not therefore find fault with the established system of jurisprudence, but brings forward facts and arguments to prove his own innocence. Besides, how few people there are who can elevate themselves from the acquiescence in what *is*, to the consideration of what *ought to be*; and if they could do so, the way to get rid of a punishment is not (as we have just observed) to say, "You have no right to punish me in this manner," but to say, "I am innocent of the offence." The fraudulent baker at Constantinople, who is about to be baked to death in his own oven, does not complain of the severity of baking bakers, but promises to use more flour and less fraud.

Whence comes it (we should like to ask Sir John Singleton Copley, who seems to dread so much the conflicts of talent in criminal cases) that a method of getting at truth which is found so serviceable in civil cases should be so much objected to in criminal cases? Would you have all this wrangling and bickering, it is asked, and contentious eloquence, when the life of a man is concerned? Why not, as well as when his property is concerned? It is either a good means of doing justice, or it is not, that two understandings should be put in opposition to each other, and that a third should decide between them. Does this open every view which can bear upon the question? Does it in the most effectual manner watch the Judge, detect perjury, and sift evidence? If not, why is it suffered to disgrace our civil institutions? If it effect all these objects, why is it not incorporated into our criminal law? Of what importance is a little disgust at professional tricks, if the solid advantage gained be a nearer approximation to truth? Can anything be more preposterous than this preference of taste to justice, and of solemnity to truth? What an eulogium of a trial to say, "I am by no means satisfied that the Jury were right in finding the prisoner guilty; but everything was carried on with the utmost decorum! The verdict was wrong; but there was the most perfect propriety and order in the proceedings. The man will be unfairly hanged; but all was genteel!" If solemnity is what is principally wanted in a court of justice, we had better study the manners of the old Spanish Inquisition; but if battles with the Judge, and battles among the counsel, are the best method, as they certainly are, of getting at the truth, better tolerate this philosophical Billingsgate, than persevere, *because* the life of a man is at stake, in solemn and polished injustice.

Why should it not be just as wise and equitable to leave the defendant without counsel in civil cases — and to tell him that the Judge was his counsel? And if the reply is to produce such injurious effects as are anticipated upon the minds of the Jury in criminal cases, why not in civil cases also? In twenty-eight cases out of thirty, the verdict in civil cases is correct; in the two remaining cases, the error may proceed from other causes than the right of reply; and yet the right of reply has existed in all. In a vast majority of cases, the verdict is for the plaintiff, not because there is a right of reply, but because he who has it in his power to decide whether he will go to law or not, and resolves to expose himself to the expense and trouble of a lawsuit, has probably a good foundation for his claim. Nobody, of course, can intend to say that the majority of verdicts in favour of plaintiffs are against justice, and merely attributable to the advantage of a last speech. If this were the case, the sooner advocates are turned out of court the better — and then the improvement of both civil and criminal law would be an abolition of all speeches; for those who dread the effect of the last word upon the fate of

the prisoner must remember that there is at present always a last speech against the prisoner; for, as the counsel for the prosecution cannot be replied to, *his* is the last speech.

There is certainly this difference between a civil and a criminal case—that in one a new trial can be granted, in the other not. But you must first make up your mind whether this system of contentious investigation by opposite advocates is or is not the best method of getting at truth: if it be, the more irremediable the decision, the more powerful and perfect should be the means of deciding; and then it would be a less oppression if the civil defendant were deprived of counsel than the criminal prisoner. When an error has been committed, the advantage is greater to the latter of these persons than to the former;—the criminal is not tried again, but pardoned; while the civil defendant must run the chance of another Jury.

If the effect of reply, and the contention of counsel, have all these baneful consequences in felony, why not also in misdemeanour and high treason? Half the cases at Sessions are cases of misdemeanour, where counsel are employed and half-informed Justices preside instead of learned Judges. There are no complaints of the unfairness of verdicts, though there are every now and then of the severity of punishments. Now, if the reasoning of Mr. Lamb's opponents were true, the disturbing force of the prisoner's counsel must fling everything into confusion. The Court for misdemeanours must be a scene of riot and perplexity; and the detection and punishment of crime must be utterly impossible: and yet in the very teeth of these objections, such courts of justice are just as orderly in one set of offences as the other; and the conviction of a guilty person just as certain and as easy.

The prosecutor (if this system were altered) would have the choice of counsel; so he has now—with this difference, that, at present, his counsel cannot be answered nor opposed. It would be better in all cases, if two men of exactly equal talent could be opposed to each other; but as this is impossible, the system must be taken with its inconvenience; but there can be no inequality between counsel so great as that between any counsel and the prisoner pleading for himself. "It has been lately my lot," says Mr. Denman, "to try two prisoners who were deaf and dumb, and who could only be made to understand what was passing by the signs of their friends. The cases were clear and simple; but if they had been circumstantial cases, in what a situation would the Judge and Jury be placed, when the prisoner could have no counsel to plead for him!"—(*Debates of the House of Commons, April* 25, 1826.)

The folly of being counsel for yourself is so notorious in civil cases, that it has grown into a proverb. But the cruelty of the law compels a man, in criminal cases, to be guilty of a much greater act of folly, and to trust his life to an advocate, who, by the common sense of mankind, is pronounced to be inadequate to defend the possession of an acre of land.

In all cases it must be supposed, that reasonably convenient instruments are selected to effect the purpose in view. A Judge may be commonly presumed to understand his profession, and a Jury to have a fair allowance of common sense; but the objectors to the improvement we recommend appear to make no such suppositions. Counsel are always to make flashy addresses to the passions. Juries are to be so much struck with them, that they are always to acquit or to condemn, contrary to justice; and Judges are always to be so biassed, that they are to fling themselves rashly into the opposite scale against the prisoner. Many cases of misdemeanour consign a man to infamy, and cast a blot upon his posterity. Judges and Juries must feel these cases as strongly as any cases of felony; and yet, in spite of this, and in spite of the free permission of counsel to speak, they preserve their judgment, and command their feelings surprisingly. Generally speaking, we believe none of these evils would take place. Trumpery declamation would be considered as discreditable to the counsel, and would

be disregarded by the Jury. The Judge and Jury (as in civil cases) would gain the habit of looking to the facts, selecting the arguments, and coming to reasonable conclusions. It is so in all other countries—and it would be so in this. But the vigilance of the Judge is to relax, if there is counsel for the prisoner. Is, then, the relaxed vigilance of the Judges complained of, in high treason, in misdemeanour, or in civil cases? This appears to us really to shut up the debate, and to preclude reply. *Why* is the practice so good in all other cases, and so pernicious in felony alone? This question has never received even the shadow of an answer. There is no one objection against the allowance of counsel to prisoners in felony, which does not apply to them in all cases. If the vigilance of Judges depend upon this injustice to the prisoner, then, the greater injustice to the prisoner, the more vigilance; and so the true method of perfecting the Bench would be, to deny the prisoner the power of calling witnesses, and to increase as much as possible the disparity between the accuser and the accused. We hope men are selected for *the Judges of Israel* whose vigilance depends upon better and higher principles.

There are three methods of arranging a trial, as to the mode of employing counsel—that both parties should have counsel, or neither—or only one. The first method is the best; the second is preferable to the last; and the last, which is our present system, is the worst possible. If counsel were denied to either of the parties, if it be necessary that any system of jurisprudence should be disgraced by such an act of injustice, they should rather be denied to the prosecutor than to the prisoner.

But the most singular caprice of the law is, that counsel are permitted in very high crimes, and in very small crimes, and denied in crimes of a sort of medium description. In high treason, where you mean to murder Lord Liverpool, and to levy war against the people, and to blow up the two Houses of Parliament, all the lawyers of Westminster Hall may talk themselves dry, and the Jury deaf. Lord Eldon, when at the bar, has been heard for nine hours on such subjects. If, instead of producing the destruction of five thousand people, you are indicted for the murder of one person, here human faculties, from the diminution of guilt, are supposed to be so clear and so unclouded, that the prisoner is quite adequate to make his own defence, and no counsel are allowed. Take it then upon that principle, and let the rule, and the reason of it, pass as sufficient. But if, instead of murdering the man, you have only libelled him, then, for some reason or another, though utterly unknown to us, the original imbecility of faculties in accused persons is respected, and counsel *are* allowed. Was ever such nonsense defended by public men in grave assemblies? The prosecutor, too, (as Mr. Horace Twiss justly observes,) can either allow or disallow counsel, by selecting his form of prosecution;—as where a mob had assembled to repeal, by riot and force, some unpopular statute, and certain persons had continued in that assembly for more than an hour after proclamation to disperse. That might be treated as levying war against the King, and then the prisoner would be entitled to receive (as Lord George Gordon did receive) the benefit of counsel. It might also be treated as a seditious rite; then it would be a misdemeanour, and counsel would still be allowed. But if government had a mind to destroy the prisoner effectually, they have only to abstain from the charge of treason, and to introduce into the indictment the aggravation, that the prisoner had continued with the mob for an hour after proclamation to disperse; this is a felony, the prisoner's life is in jeopardy, and counsel are effectually excluded. It produces, in many other cases disconnected with treason, the most scandalous injustice. A receiver of stolen goods, who employs a young girl to rob her master, may be tried for the misdemeanour; the young girl taken afterwards would be tried for the felony. The receiver would be punishable only with fine, imprisonment, or whipping, and he

could have counsel to defend him. The girl indicted for felony, and liable to death, would enjoy no such advantage.

In the comparison between felony and treason there are certainly some arguments why counsel should be allowed in felony rather than in treason. Persons accused of treason are generally persons of education and rank, accustomed to assemblies, and to public speaking, while men accused of felony are commonly of the lowest of the people. If it be true, that Judges in cases of high treason are more liable to be influenced by the Crown, and to lean against the prisoner, this cannot apply to cases of misdemeanour, or to the defendants in civil cases; but if it be necessary, that Judges should be watched in political cases, how often are cases of felony connected with political disaffection! Every Judge, too, has his idiosyncrasies, which require to be watched. Some hate Dissenters — some mobs; some have one weakness, some another; and the ultimate truth is, that no court of justice is safe, unless there is some one present whose occupation and interest it is to watch the safety of the prisoner. Till then, no man of right feeling can be easy at the administration of justice, and the punishment of death.

Two men are accused of one offence; the one dexterous, bold, subtle, gifted with speech, and remarkable for presence of mind; the other timid, hesitating, and confused — is there any reason why the chances of these two men for acquittal should be, as they are, so very different? Inequalities there will be in the means of defence under the best system, but there is no occasion the law should make these greater than they are left by chance or nature.

But (it is asked) what practical injustice is done — what practical evil is there in the present system? The great object of all law is, that the guilty should be punished, and that the innocent should be acquitted. A very great majority of prisoners, we admit, are guilty — and so clearly guilty, that we believe they would be found guilty under any system; but among the number of those who are tried, *some* are innocent, and the chance of establishing their innocence is very much diminished by the privation of counsel. In the course of twenty or thirty years, among the whole mass of English prisoners, we believe *many* are found guilty who are innocent, and who would not have been found guilty, if an able and intelligent man had watched over their interest, and represented their case. If this happen only to two or three every year, it is quite a sufficient reason why the law should be altered. That such cases exist we firmly believe; and this is the practical evil — perceptible to men of sense and reflection; but not likely to become the subject of general petition. To ask why there are not petitions — why the evil is not more noticed, is mere parliamentary froth and ministerial juggling. Gentlemen are rarely hung. If they were so, there would be petitions without end for counsel. The creatures exposed to the cruelties and injustice of the law are dumb creatures, who feel the evil without being able to express their feeling. Besides, the question is not, whether the evil is found out, but whether the evil exist. Whoever thinks it is an evil, should vote against it, whether the sufferer from the injustice discover it to be an injustice, or whether he suffer in ignorant silence. When the bill was enacted, which allowed counsel for treason, there was not a petition from one end of England to the other. Can there be a more shocking answer from the Ministerial Bench, than to say, For real evil we care nothing — only for detected evil? We will set about curing any wrong which affects our popularity and power: but as to any other evil, we wait till the people find it out; and, in the meantime, commit such evils to the care of Mr. George Lamb, and of Sir James Mackintosh. We are sure so good a man as Mr. Peel can never feel in this manner.

Howard devoted himself to his country. It was a noble example.

Let two gentlemen on the Ministerial side of the House (we only ask for two) commit some crimes, which will render their execution a matter of painful necessity. Let them feel, and report to the House, all the injustice and inconvenience of having neither a copy of the indictment, nor a list of witnesses, nor counsel to defend them. We will venture to say, that the evidence of two such persons would do more for the improvement of the criminal law, than all the orations of Mr. Lamb, or the lucubrations of Beccaria. Such evidence would save time, and bring the question to an issue. It is a great duty, and ought to be fulfilled—and in ancient Rome, would have been fulfilled.

The opponents always forget that Mr. Lamb's plan is not to *compel* prisoners to have counsel, but to *allow* them to have counsel, if they choose to do so. Depend upon it, as Dr. Johnson says, when a man is going to be hanged, his faculties are wonderfully concentrated. If it be really true, as the defenders of *Mumpsimus* observe, that the Judge is the best counsel for the prisoner, the prisoner will soon learn to employ him, especially as his Lordship works without fees. All that we want is an option given to the prisoner—that a man, left to adopt his own means of defence in every trifling civil right, may have the same power of selecting his own auxiliaries for higher interests.

But nothing can be more unjust than to speak of Judges, as if they were of one standard, and one heart and head pattern. The great majority of Judges, we have no doubt, are upright and pure; but some have been selected for flexible politics — some are passionate —some are in a hurry — some are violent churchmen — some resemble ancient females — some have the gout — some are eighty years old — some are blind, deaf, and have lost the power of smelling. All one to the unhappy prisoner — he has no choice.

It is impossible to put so gross an insult upon Judges, Jurymen, Grand Jurymen, or any person connected with the administration of justice, as to suppose that the longer time to be taken up by the speeches of counsel constitutes the grand bar to the proposed alteration. If three hours would acquit a man, and he is hanged because he is only allowed two hours for his defence, the poor man is as much murdered as if his throat had been cut before he came into Court. If twelve Judges cannot do the most perfect justice, other twelve must be appointed. Strange administration of criminal law, to adhere obstinately to an inadequate number of Judges, and to refuse any improvement which is incompatible with this arbitrary and capricious enactment. Neither is it quite certain that the proposed alteration would create a greater demand upon the time of the Court. At present the counsel makes a defence by long cross-examinations, and examinations in chief of the witnesses, and the Judge allows a greater latitude than he would do, if the counsel of the prisoner were permitted to speak. The counsel by these oblique methods, and by stating false points of law for the express purpose of introducing facts, endeavours to obviate the injustice of the law, and takes up more time by this oblique, than he would do by a direct defence. But the best answer to this objection of time (which, if true, is no objection at all) is, that as many misdemeanours as felonies are tried in a given time, though counsel are allowed in the former, and not in the latter case.

One excuse for the absence of counsel is, that the evidence upon which the prisoner is convicted is always so clear, that the counsel cannot gainsay it. This is mere absurdity. There is not, and cannot be, any such rule. Many a man has been hung upon a string of circumstantial evidence, which not only very ingenious men, but very candid and judicious men, might criticise and call in question. If no one were found guilty but upon such evidence as would not admit of a doubt, half the crimes in the world would be unpunished. This dictum, by which the present practice has often been defended, was adopted by Lord Chancellor Nottingham. To the lot of this Chancellor,

however, it fell to pass sentence of death upon Lord Stafford, whom (as Mr. Denman justly observes) no court of justice, not even the House of Lords (constituted as it was in those days), could have put to death, if he had had counsel to defend him.

To improve the criminal law of England, and to make it really deserving of the incessant eulogium which is lavished upon it, we would assimilate trials for felony to trials for high treason. The prisoner should not only have counsel, but a copy of the indictment and a list of the witnesses, many days antecedent to the trial. It is in the highest degree unjust that I should not see and study the description of the crime with which I am charged, if the most scrupulous exactness be required in that instrument which charges me with crime. If the place *where*, the time *when*, and the manner *how*, and the persons by whom, must all be specified with the most perfect accuracy, if any deviation from this accuracy is fatal, the prisoner, or his legal advisers, should have a full opportunity of judging whether the scruples of the law have been attended to in the formation of the indictment; and they ought not to be confined to the hasty and imperfect consideration which can be given to an indictment exhibited for the first time in Court. Neither is it possible for the prisoner to repel accusation till he knows who is to be brought against him. He may see suddenly, stuck up in the witness's box, a man who has been writing him letters, to extort money from the threat of evidence he could produce. The character of such a witness would be destroyed in a moment, if the letters were produced; and the letters would have been produced, of course, if the prisoner had imagined such a person would have been brought forward by the prosecutor. It is utterly impossible for a prisoner to know in what way he may be assailed, and against what species of attacks he is to guard. Conversations may be brought against him which he has forgotten, and to which he could (upon notice) have given another colour and complexion. Actions are made to bear upon his case, which (if he had known they would have been referred to) might have been explained in the most satisfactory manner. All these modes of attack are pointed out by the list of witnesses transmitted to the prisoner, and he has time to prepare his answer, as it is perfectly just he should have. This is justice, when a prisoner has ample means of compelling the attendance of his witnesses; when his written accusation is put into his hand, and he has time to study it—when he knows in what manner his guilt is to be proved, and when he has a man of practised understanding to state his facts, and prefer his arguments. Then criminal justice may march on boldly. The Judge has no stain of blood on his ermine; and the phrases which English people are so fond of lavishing upon the humanity of their laws will have a real foundation. At present this part of the law is a mere relic of the barbarous injustice by which accusation in the early part of our jurisprudence was always confounded with guilt. The greater part of these abuses have been brushed away, as this cannot fail soon to be. In the meantime it is defended (as every other abuse has been defended) by men who think it their duty to defend everything which *is*, and to dread everything which *is not*. We are told that the Judge does what he does not do, and ought not to do. The most pernicious effects are anticipated in trials of felony, from that which is found to produce the most perfect justice in civil causes, and in cases of treason and misdemeanour: we are called upon to continue a practice without example in any other country, and are required by lawyers to consider that custom as humane, which every one who is not a lawyer pronounces to be most cruel and unjust—and which has not been brought forward to general notice, only because its bad effects are confined to the last and lowest of mankind.*

* All this nonsense is now put an end to. Counsel is allowed to the prisoner, and they are permitted to speak in his defence.

CATHOLICS. (E. REVIEW, 1827.)

1. *A Plain Statement in support of the Political Claims of the Roman Catholics; in a Letter to the Rev. Sir George Lee, Bart.* By Lord Nugent, Member of Parliament for Aylesbury. London. Hookham. 1826.
2. *A Letter to Viscount Milton, M.P.* By One of his Constituents. London. Ridgway. 1827.
3. *Charge by the Archbishop of Cashel.* Dublin. Milliken.

IF a poor man were to accept a guinea upon the condition that he spoke all the evil he could of another whom he believed to be innocent, and whose imprisonment he knew he should prolong, and whose privations he knew he should increase by his false testimony, would not the person so hired be one of the worst and basest of human beings? And would not his guilt be aggravated, if, up to the moment of receiving his *aceldama*, he had spoken in terms of high praise of the person whom he subsequently accused? Would not the latter feature of the case prove him to be as much without shame as the former evinced him to be without principle? Would the guilt be less, if the person so hired were a man of education? Would it be less, if he were above want? Would it be less, if the profession and occupation of his life were to decide men's rights, or to teach them morals and religion? Would it be less by the splendour of the bribe? Does a bribe of 3000*l.* leave a man innocent, whom a bribe of 30*l.* would cover with infamy? You are of a mature period of life, when the opinions of an honest man ought to be, and are fixed. On Monday you were a barrister or a country clergyman, a serious and temperate friend to religious liberty and Catholic emancipation. In a few weeks from this time you are a bishop, or a dean, or a judge —publishing and speaking charges and sermons against the poor Catholics, and explaining away this sale of your soul by every species of falsehood, shabbiness, and equivocation. You may carry a bit of ermine on your shoulder, or hide the lower moiety of the body in a silken petticoat—and men may call you Mr. Dean, or My Lord; but you have sold your honour and your conscience for money; and, though better paid, you are as base as the witness who stands at the door of the judgment-hall, to swear whatever the suborner will put into his mouth, and to receive whatever he will put in his pocket.*

When soldiers exercise, there stands a goodly portly person out of the ranks, upon whom all eyes are directed, and whose signs and motions, in the performance of the manual exercise, all the soldiers follow. The Germans, we believe, call him a *Flugelman*. We propose Lord Nugent as a political flugelman;—he is always consistent, plain, and honest, steadily and straightly pursuing his object without hope or fear, under the influence of good feelings and high principle. The House of Commons does not contain within its walls a more honest, upright man.

We seize upon the opportunity which this able pamphlet of his Lordship's affords us, to renew our attention to the Catholic question. There is little new to be said; but we must not be silent, or, in these days of baseness and tergiversation, we shall be supposed to have deserted our friend the Pope; and they will say of us, *Prostant venales apud Lambeth et Whitehall.* God forbid it should ever be said of us with justice—it is pleasant to loll and roll, and to accumulate—to be a purple and fine linen man, and to be called by some of those nicknames which frail and ephemeral beings are so fond of accumulating upon each other;—but the best thing of all is to live like honest men, and to add something to the cause of liberality, justice, and truth.

The Letter to Lord Milton is very well and very pleasantly written. We are delighted with the liberality and candour of the Archbishop of Cashel.

* It is very far from our intention to say that all who were for the Catholics, and are now against them, have made this change from base motives; it is equally far from our intention not to say that many men of both professions have subjected themselves to this shocking imputation.

The charge is in the highest degree creditable to him. He must lay his account for the furious hatred of bigots, and the incessant gnawing of rats.

There are many men who (thoroughly aware that the Catholic question must be ultimately carried) delay their acquiescence till the last moment, and wait till the moment of peril and civil war before they yield. That this moment is not quite so remote as was supposed a twelvemonth since, the events now passing in the world seem to afford the strongest proof. The truth is, that the disaffected state of Ireland is a standing premium for war with every cabinet in Europe which has the most distant intention of quarrelling with this country for any other cause. "*If we are to go to war, let us do so when the discontents of Ireland are at their greatest height, before any spirit of concession has been shown by the British Cabinet.*" Does any man imagine that so plain and obvious a principle has not been repeatedly urged on the French Cabinet?—that the eyes of the Americans are shut upon the state of Ireland—and that that great and ambitious Republic will not, in case of war, aim a deadly blow at this most sensitive part of the British empire? We should really say, that England has fully as much to fear from Irish fraternisation with America as with France. The language is the same; the Americans have preceded them in the struggle; the number of emigrant and rebel Irish is very great in America; and all parties are sure of perfect toleration under the protection of America. We are astonished at the madness and folly of Englishmen, who do not perceive that both France and America are only waiting for a convenient opportunity to go to war with this country; and that one of the first blows aimed at our independence would be the invasion of Ireland.

We should like to argue this matter with a regular Tory Lord, whose members vote steadily against the Catholic question. "I wonder that mere fear does not make you give up the Catholic question! Do you mean to put this fine place in danger—the venison—the pictures—the pheasants—the cellars—the hot-house and the grapery? Should you like to see six or seven thousand French or Americans landed in Ireland, and aided by a universal insurrection of the Catholics? Is it worth your while to run the risk of their success? What evil from the possible encroachment of Catholics, by civil exertions, can equal the danger of such a position as this? How can a man of your carriages, and horses, and hounds, think of putting your high fortune in such a predicament, and crying out, like a schoolboy or a chaplain, 'Oh, we shall beat them! we shall put the rascals down!' No Popery, I admit to your Lordship, is a very convenient cry at an election, and has answered your end; but do not push the matter too far: to bring on a civil war, for No Popery, is a very foolish proceeding in a man who has two courses and a remove! As you value your side-board of plate, your broad riband, your pier glasses—if obsequious domestics and large rooms are dear to you—if you love ease and flattery, titles and coats of arms—if the labour of the French cook, the dedication of the expecting poet, can move you—if you hope for a long life of side-dishes—if you are not insensible to the periodical arrival of the turtle fleets—emancipate the Catholics! Do it for your ease, do it for your indolence, do it for your safety—emancipate and eat, emancipate and drink—emancipate, and preserve the rent-roll and the family estate!"

The most common excuse of the *Great Shabby* is, that the Catholics are their own enemies—that the violence of Mr. O'Connell and Mr. Shiel have ruined their cause—that, but for these boisterous courses, the question would have been carried before this time. The answer to this nonsense and baseness is, that the very reverse is the fact. The mild and the long-suffering may suffer for ever in this world. If the Catholics had stood with their hands before them simpering at the Earls of Liverpool and the Lords Bathurst of the moment, they would not have been

emancipated till the year of our Lord four thousand. As long as the patient will suffer, the cruel will kick. No treason—no rebellion—but as much stubbornness and stoutness as the law permits — a thorough intimation that you know what is your due, and that you are determined to have it if you can *lawfully* get it. This is the conduct we recommend to the Irish. If they go on withholding, and forbearing, and hesitating whether this is the time for the discussion or that is the time, they will be laughed at for another century as fools — and kicked for another century as slaves. "I must have my bill paid (says the sturdy and irritated tradesman); your master has put me off twenty times under different pretences. I know he is at home, and I will not quit the premises till I get the money." Many a tradesman gets paid in this manner, who would soon smirk and smile himself into the Gazette, if he trusted to the promises of the great.

Can anything be so utterly childish and foolish as to talk of the bad taste of the Catholic leaders? — as if, in a question of conferring on, or withholding important civil rights from seven millions of human beings, anything could arrest the attention of a wise man but the good or evil consequences of so great a measure. Suppose Mr. S. does smell slightly of tobacco — admit Mr. L. to be occasionally stimulated by rum and water—allow that Mr. F. was unfeeling in speaking of the Duke of York—what has all this nonsense to do with the extinction of religious hatred and the pacification of Ireland? Give it if it is right, refuse it if it is wrong. How it is asked, or how it is given or refused, are less than the dust of the balance.

What is the real reason why a good honest Tory, living at ease on his possessions, is an enemy to Catholic Emancipation? He admits the Catholic of his own rank to be a gentleman, and not a bad subject — and about theological disputes an excellent Tory never troubles his head. Of what importance is it to him whether an Irish Catholic or an Irish Protestant is a Judge in the King's Bench at Dublin? None; but *I am afraid for the Church of Ireland*, says our alarmist. Why do you care so much for the Church of Ireland, a country you never live in? — *Answer — I do not care so much for the Church of Ireland, if I was sure the Church of England would not be destroyed.*—And is it for the Church of England alone that you fear? — *Answer — Not quite to that. But I am afraid we should all be lost, that everything would be overturned, and that I should lose my rank and my estate.* Here then, we say, is a long series of dangers, which (if there were any chance of their ever taking place) would require half a century for their development; and the danger of losing Ireland by insurrection and invasion, which may happen in six months, is utterly overlooked, and forgotten. And if a foreign influence should ever be fairly established in Ireland, how many hours would the Irish Church, how many months would the English Church, live after such an event! How much is any English title worth after such an event — any English family — any English estate? We are astonished that the brains of rich Englishmen do not fall down into their bellies in talking of the Catholic question—that they do not reason through the cardia and the pylorus — that all the organs of digestion do not become intellectual. The descendants of the proudest noblemen in England may become beggars in a foreign land from this disgraceful nonsense of the Catholic question—fit only for the ancient females of a market town.

What alarms us in the state of England is the uncertain basis on which its prosperity is placed—and the prodigious mass of hatred which the English government continues, by its obstinate bigotry, to accumulate—eight hundred and forty millions sterling of debt. The revenue depending upon the demand for the shoes, stockings, and breeches of Europe — and seven millions of Catholics in a state of the greatest fury and exasperation. We persecute as if we did not *owe* a shilling — we spend as if we had no disaffection. This, by possibility, may go on; but it is dangerous walking—the

chance is, there will be a fall. No wise man should take such a course. All probabilities are against it. We are astonished that Lord Hertford and Lord Lowther, shrewd and calculating Tories, do not see that it is nine to one against such a game.

It is not only the event of war we fear in the military struggle with Ireland ; but the expense of war, and the expenses of the English government, are paving the way for future revolutions. The world never yet saw so extravagant a government as the Government of England. Not only is economy not practised — but it is despised; and the idea of it connected with disaffection, Jacobinism, and Joseph Hume. Every rock in the ocean where a cormorant can perch is occupied by our troops — has a governor, deputy-governor, storekeeper, and deputy-storekeeper — and will soon have an archdeacon and a bishop. Military colleges, with thirty-four professors, educating seventeen ensigns per annum, being half an ensign for each professor, with every species of nonsense, athletic, sartorial, and plumigerous. A just and necessary war costs this country about one hundred pounds a minute ; whipcord fifteen thousand pounds ; red tape seven thousand pounds ; lace for drummers and fifers, nineteen thousand pounds ; a pension to one man who has broken his head at the Pole ; to another who has shattered his leg at the Equator ; subsidies to Persia ; secret service-money to Thibet ; an annuity to Lady Henry Somebody and her seven daughters — the husband being shot at some place where we never ought to have had any soldiers at all ; and the elder brother returning four members to Parliament. Such a scene of extravagance, corruption, and expense as must paralyse the industry, and mar the fortunes, of the most industrious, spirited people that ever existed.

Few men consider the historical view which will be taken of present events. The bubbles of last year ; the fishing for half-crowns in Vigo Bay ; the Milk Muffin and Crumpet Companies ; the Apple, Pear, and Plum Associations ; the National Gooseberry and Currant Company ; will all be remembered as instances of that partial madness to which society is occasionally exposed. What will be said of all the intolerable trash which is issued forth at public meetings of No Popery ? The follies of one century are scarcely credible in that which succeeds it. A grandmamma of 1827 is as wise as a very wise man of 1727. If the world lasts till 1927, the grandmammas of that period will be far wiser than the tip-top No Popery men of this day. That this childish nonsense will have got out of the drawing-room, there can be no doubt. It will most probably have passed through the steward's room, and butler's pantry, into the kitchen. This is the case with ghosts. They no longer loll on couches and sip tea ; but are down on their knees scrubbing with the scullion — or stand sweating, and basting with the cook. Mrs. Abigail turns up her nose at them, and the housekeeper declares for flesh and blood, and will have none of their company.

It is delicious to the persecution-fanciers to reflect that no general bill has passed in favour of the Protestant Dissenters. They are still disqualified from holding any office—and are only protected from prosecution by an annual indemnity act. So that the sword of Damocles still hangs over them — not suspended indeed by a thread, but by a cart-rope—still it hangs there an insult, if not an injury, and prevents the painful idea from presenting itself to the mind of perfect toleration, and pure justice. There is the larva of tyranny, and the skeleton of malice. Now this is all we presume to ask for the Catholics — admission to Parliament, exclusion from every possible office by law, an annual indemnity for the breach of law. This is surely much more agreeable to feebleness, to littleness, and to narrowness, than to say, the Catholics are as free, and as eligible, as ourselves.

The most intolerable circumstance of the Catholic dispute is, the conduct of the Dissenters. Any man may dissent from the Church of England, and

preach against it, by paying sixpence. Almost every tradesman in a market town is a preacher. It must absolutely be ride-and-tie with them; the butcher must hear the baker in the morning, and the baker listen to the butcher in the afternoon, or there would be no congregation. We have often speculated upon the peculiar trade of the preacher from his style of action. Some have a tying-up or parcel-packing action; some strike strongly against the anvil of the pulpit; some screw, some bore, some act as if they were managing a needle. The occupation of the preceding week can seldom be mistaken. In the country, three or four thousand Ranters are sometimes encamped, supplicating in religious platoons, or roaring psalms out of waggons. Now all this freedom is very proper; because, though it is abused, yet in truth there is no other principle in religious matters, than to let men alone as long as they keep the peace. Yet we should imagine this unbounded licence of Dissenters should teach them a little charity towards the Catholics, and a little respect for their religious freedom. But the picture of sects is this—there are twenty fettered men in a gaol, and every one is employed in loosening his own fetters with one hand, and riveting those of his neighbour with the other.

"'If then,' says a minister of our own Church, the Reverend John Fisher, rector of Wavenden, in this county, in a sermon published some years ago, and entitled 'The Utility of the Church Establishment, and its Safety consistent with Religious Freedom'—'If, then, the Protestant religion could have originally worked its way in this country against numbers, prejudices, bigotry, and interest; if, in times of its infancy, the power of the prince could not prevail against it; surely, when confirmed by age, and rooted in the affections of the people—when invested with authority, and in full enjoyment of wealth and power—when cherished by a Sovereign who holds his very throne by this sacred tenure, and whose conscientious attachment to it well warrants the title of Defender of the Faith—surely any attack upon it must be contemptible, any alarm of danger must be imaginary.'"—(*Lord Nugent's Letter*, p. 18.)

To go into a committee upon the state of the Catholic Law is to reconsider, as Lord Nugent justly observes, passages in our domestic history, which bear date about 270 years ago. Now, what human plan, device, or invention, 270 years old, does not require reconsideration? If a man dressed as he dressed 270 years ago, the pug-dogs in the streets would tear him to pieces. If he lived in the houses of 270 years ago, unrevised and uncorrected, he would die of rheumatism in a week. If he listened to the sermons of 270 years ago, he would perish with sadness and fatigue; and when a man cannot make a coat or a cheese, for 50 years together, without making them better, can it be said that laws made in those days of ignorance, and framed in the fury of religious hatred, need no revision, and are capable of no amendment?

We have not the smallest partiality for the Catholic religion; quite the contrary. That it should exist at all—that all Catholics are not converted to the Protestant religion—we consider to be a serious evil; but there they are, with their spirit as strong, and their opinions as decided, as your own. The Protestant part of the Cabinet have quite given up all idea of putting them to death; what remains to be done? We all admit the evil; the object is to make it as little as possible. One method commonly resorted to, we are sure, does not lessen, but increase the evil; and that is, to falsify history, and deny plain and obvious facts, to the injury of the Catholics. No true friend to the Protestant religion and to the Church of England will ever have recourse to such disingenuous arts as these.

"Our historics have not, I believe, stated what is untrue of Queen Mary, nor, perhaps, have they very much exaggerated what is true of her; but our arguers, whose only talk is of Smithfield, are generally very uncandid in what they conceal. It would appear to be little known, that the statutes which enabled Mary to burn those who had conformed to the Church of her father and brother, were Protestant statutes, declaring the common law against heresy, and framed by her father Henry,

the Eighth, and confirmed and acted upon by Order of Council of her brother Edward the Sixth, enabling that mild and temperate young sovereign to burn divers misbelievers, by sentence of commissioners (little better, says Neale, than a Protestant Inquisition) appointed to 'examine and search after all Anabaptists, Heretics, or contemners of the Book of Common Prayer.' It would appear to be seldom considered, that her zeal might very possibly have been warmed by the circumstance of both her chaplains having been imprisoned for their religion, and herself arbitrarily detained, and her safety threatened, during the short but persecuting reign of her brother. The sad evidences of the violence of those days are by no means confined to her acts. The fagots of persecution were not kindled by Papists only, nor did they cease to blaze when the power of using them as instruments of conversion ceased to be in Popish hands. Cranmer himself, in his dreadful death, met with but equal measure for the flames to which he had doomed several who denied the *spiritual* supremacy of Henry the Eighth: to which he had doomed also a Dutch Arian, in Edward the Sixth's reign; and to which, with great pains and difficulty, he had persuaded that prince to doom another miserable enthusiast, Joan Bocher, for some metaphysical notions of her own on the divine incarnation. 'So that on both sides' (says Lord Herbert of Cherbury) 'it grew a bloody time.' Calvin burned Servetus at Geneva for 'discoursing concerning the Trinity, contrary to the sense of the whole church; and thereupon set forth a book wherein he giveth an account of his doctrine, and of whatever else had passed in this affair, and teacheth that the sword may be lawfully employed against heretics.' Yet Calvin was no Papist. John Knox extolled in his writings, as 'the godly fact of James Melvil,' the savage murder by which Cardinal Beaton was made to expiate his many and cruel persecutions; a murder to which, by the great popular eloquence of Knox, his fellow-labourers in the vineyard of reformation, Lesly and Melvil, had been excited; and yet John Knox, and Lesly, and Melvil, were no Papists. Henry the Eighth, whose one virtue was impartiality in these matters (if an impartial and evenly-balanced persecution of all sects be a virtue), beheaded a chancellor and a bishop, because, having admitted his civil supremacy, they doubted his spiritual. Of the latter of them Lord Herbert says, 'The pope, who suspected not, perchance, that the bishop's end was so near, had, for more testimony of his favour to him as disaffection to our king, sent him a cardinal's hat; but unseasonably, his head being off.' He beheaded the Countess of Salisbury, because at upwards of eighty years old she wrote a letter to Cardinal Pole, her own son; and he burned Barton, the 'Holy Maid of Kent,' for a prophecy of his death. He burned four Anabaptists in one day for opposing the doctrine of infant baptism; and he burned Lambert and Anne Ascue, and Belerican, and Lascells, and Adams, on another day, for opposing that of transubstantiation; with many others of lesser note, who refused to subscribe to his Six Bloody Articles, as they were called, or whose opinions fell short of his, or exceeded them, or who abided by opinions after he had abandoned them; and all this after the Reformation. And yet Henry the Eighth was the sovereign who first delivered us from the yoke of Rome.

"In later times, thousands of Protestant Dissenters of the four great sects were made to languish in loathsome prisons, and hundreds to perish miserably, during the reign of Charles the Second, under a Protestant High Church Government, who then first applied, in the prayer for the Parliament, the epithets of 'most religious and gracious' to a sovereign whom they knew to be profligate and unprincipled beyond example, and had reason to suspect to be a concealed Papist.

"Later still, Archbishop Sharp was sacrificed by the murderous enthusiasm of certain Scotch Covenanters, who yet appear to have sincerely believed themselves inspired by Heaven to this act of cold-blooded barbarous assassination.

"On subjects like these, silence on all sides, and a mutual interchange of repentance, forgiveness, and oblivion, is wisdom. But to quote grievances on one side only, is not honesty."—(*Lord Nugent's Letter*, pp. 24—27.)

Sir Richard Birnie can only attend to the complaints of individuals; but no cases of swindling are brought before him so atrocious as the violation of the Treaty of Limerick, and the disappointment of those hopes, and the frustration of that arrangement; which hopes and which arrangements were held out as one of the great arguments for the Union. The chapter of English Fraud comes next to the chapter of English Cruelty, in the history of Ireland — and both are equally disgraceful.

Nothing can be more striking than the conduct of the parent Legislature to the Legislature of the West Indian

Islands. "We cannot leave you to yourselves upon these points" (says the English Government); "the wealth of the planter, and the commercial prosperity of the islands, are not the only points to be looked to. We must look to the general rights of humanity, and see that they are not outraged in the case of the poor slave. It is impossible we can be satisfied till we know that he is placed in a state of progress and amelioration." How beautiful is all this! and how wise, and how humane and affecting are our efforts throughout Europe to put an end to the Slave Trade! Wherever three or four negotiators are gathered together, a British diplomate appears among them, with some article of kindness and pity for the poor negro. All is mercy and compassion, except when wretched Ireland is concerned. The saint who swoons at the lashes of the Indian slave is the encourager of No Popery Meetings, and the hard, bigoted, domineering tyrant of Ireland.

See the folly of delaying to settle a question which, in the end, must be settled, and, ere long, to the advantage of the Catholics. How the price rises by delay! This argument is extremely well put by Lord Nugent.

"I should observe that two occasions have already been lost of granting these claims, coupled with what were called securities, such as never can return. In 1808, the late Duke of Norfolk and Lord Grenville, in the one House, and Mr. Ponsonby and Mr. Grattan in the other, were authorised by the Irish Catholic body to propose a negative to be vested in the Crown upon the appointment of their bishops. Mr. Perceval, the Chancellor, and the Spiritual Bench, did not see the importance of this opportunity. It was rejected; the Irish were driven to despair; and in the same tomb with the question of 1808 lies for ever buried the Veto. The same was the fate with what were called the 'wings' attached to Sir Francis Burdett's bill of last year. I voted for them, not for the sake certainly of extending the patronage of the Crown over a new body of clergy, nor yet for the sake of diminishing the popular character of elections in Ireland, but because Mr. O'Connell, and because some of the Protestant friends of the measure who knew Ireland the best, recommended them; and because I believed, from the language of some who supported it only on these conditions, that they offered the fairest chance for the measure being carried. I voted for them as the price of Catholic emancipation, for which I can scarcely contemplate any Irish price that I would not pay. With the same object, I would vote for them again; but I shall never again have the opportunity. For these also, if they were thought of any value as securities, the events of this year in Ireland have shown you that you have lost for ever. And the necessity of the great measure becomes every day more urgent and unavoidable."—(*Lord Nugent's Letter*, pp. 71, 72.)

Can any man living say that Ireland is not in a much more dangerous state than it was before the Catholic Convention began to exist?—that the inflammatory state of that country is not becoming worse and worse?—that those men whom we call demagogues and incendiaries have not produced a very considerable and alarming effect upon the Irish population? Where is this to end? But the fool lifteth up his voice in the coffee-house, and sayeth, "We shall give them a hearty thrashing: let them rise — the sooner the better — we will soon put them down again." The fool sayeth this in the coffee-house, and the greater fool praiseth him. But does Lord Stowel say this? does Mr. Peel say this? does the Marquis of Hertford say this? do sensible, calm, and reflecting men like these, not admit the extreme danger of combatting against invasion and disaffection, and this with our forces spread in active hostility over the whole face of the globe? Can they feel this vulgar, hectoring certainty of success, and stupidly imagine that a thing cannot be because it has never yet been?—because we have hitherto maintained our tyranny in Ireland against all Europe, that we are always to maintain it? And then, what if the struggle does at last end in our favour? is the loss of English lives and of English money not to be taken into account? Is this the way in which a nation overwhelmed with debt, and trembling whether its looms and

ploughs will not be over-matched by the looms and ploughs of the rest of Europe—is this the way in which such a country is to husband its resources? Is the best blood of the land to be flung away in a war of hassocks and surplices? Are cities to be summoned for the Thirty-nine Articles, and men to be led on to the charge by professors of divinity? The expense of *keeping* such a country must be added to all other enormous expenses. What is really possessed of a country so subdued? four or five yards round a sentry-box, and no more. And in twenty years' time it is all to do over again—another war—another rebellion, and another enormous and ruinously expensive contest, with the same dreadful uncertainty of the issue! It is forgotten, too, that a new feature has arisen in the history of this country. In all former insurrections in Ireland no democratic party existed in England. The efforts of Government were left free and unimpeded. But suppose a stoppage in your manufactures coincident with a rising of the Irish Catholics, when every soldier is employed in the sacred duty of Papist-hunting. Can any man contemplate such a state of things without horror? Can any man say that he is taken by surprise for such a combination? Can any man say that any danger to Church or State is comparable to this? But for the prompt interference of the military in the early part of 1826, three or four hundred thousand starving manufacturers would have carried ruin and destruction over the north of England, and over Scotland. These dangers are inseparable from an advanced state of manufactures — but they need not the addition of other and greater perils which need not exist in any country too wise and too enlightened for persecution.

Where is the weak point in these plain arguments? Is it the remoteness of the chance of foreign war? Alas! we have been at war 35 minutes out of every hour since the Peace of Utrecht. The state of war seems more natural to man than the state of peace; and if we turn from general probabilities to the state of Europe—Greece to be liberated—Turkey to be destroyed—Portugal and Spain to be made free—the wounded vanity of the French, the increasing arrogance of the Americans, and our own philopolemical folly, are endless scenes of war. We believe it is at all times a better speculation to make ploughshares into swords than swords into ploughshares. If war is certain, we believe insurrection to be quite as certain. We cannot believe but that the French or the Americans would, in case of war, make a serious attempt upon Ireland, and that all Ireland would rush, tail foremost, into insurrection.

A new source of disquietude and war has lately risen in Ireland. Our saints, or evangelical people, or serious people, or by whatever other name they are to be designated, have taken the field in Ireland against the Pope, and are converting in the large way. Three or four Irish Catholic prelates take a post-chaise and curse the converters and the converted. A battle royal ensues with shillelas: the policeman comes in, and, reckless of Lambeth or the Vatican, makes no distinction between what is perpendicular and what is hostile, but knocks down everybody and everything which is upright; and so the feud ends for the day. We have no doubt but that these efforts will tend to bring things to a crisis much sooner between the parties than the disgraceful conduct of the Cabinet alone would do.

"It is a charge not imputed by the laws of England nor by the oaths which exclude the Catholics: for those oaths impute only spiritual errors. But it is imputed, which is more to the purpose, by those persons who approve of the excluding oaths, and wish them retained. But, to the whole of this imputation, even if no other instance could be adduced, as far as a strong and remarkable example can prove the negative of an assumption which there is not a single example to support—the full, and sufficient, and incontestable answer is Canada. Canada, which, until you can destroy the memory of all that now remains to you of your sovereignty on the North American Continent, is an answer practical, memorable, difficult to be accounted for, but blaz-

ing as the sun itself in sight of the whole world, to the whole charge of divided allegiance. At your conquest of Canada, you found it Roman Catholic; you had to choose for her a constitution in Church and State. You were wise enough not to thwart public opinion. Your own conduct towards Presbyterianism in Scotland was an example for imitation; your own conduct towards Catholicism in Ireland was a beacon for avoidance; and in Canada you established and endowed the religion of the people. Canada was your only Roman Catholic colony. Your other colonies revolted; they called on a Catholic power to support them, and they achieved their independence. Catholic Canada, with what Lord Liverpool would call her half-allegiance, *alone* stood by you. She fought by your side against the interference of Catholic France. To reward and encourage her loyalty, you endowed in Canada bishops to say mass, and to ordain others to say mass, whom, at that very time, your laws would have hanged for saying mass in England; and Canada is still yours, in spite of Catholic France, in spite of her spiritual obedience to the Pope, in spite of Lord Liverpool's argument, and in spite of the independence of all the states that surround her. This is the only trial you have made. Where you allow to the Roman Catholics their religion undisturbed, it has proved itself to be compatible with the most faithful allegiance. It is only where you have placed allegiance and religion before them as a dilemma, that they have preferred (as who will say they ought not?) their religion to their allegiance. How then stands the imputation? Disproved by history, disproved in all states where both religions co-exist, and in both hemispheres, and asserted in an exposition by Lord Liverpool, solemnly and repeatedly abjured by all Catholics, of the discipline of *their* church."—(*Lord Nugent's Letter*, pp. 35, 36.)

Can any man who has gained permission to take off his strait-waistcoat, and been out of Bedlam three weeks, believe that the Catholic question will be set to rest by the conversion of the Irish Catholics to the Protestant religion? The best chance of conversion will be gained by taking care that the point of honour is not against conversion.

"We may, I think, collect from what we know of the ordinary feelings of men, that by admitting all to a community of political benefits, we should remove a material impediment that now presents itself to the advances of proselytism to our established mode of worship; particularly assuming, as we do, that it is the purest, and that the disfranchised mode is supported only by superstition and priestcraft. By external pressure and restraint, things are compacted as well in the moral as in the physical world. Where a sect is at spiritual variance with the Established Church, it only requires an abridgment of civil privileges to render it at once a political faction. Its members become instantly pledged, some from enthusiasm, some from resentment, and many from honourable shame, to cleave with desperate fondness to the suffering fortunes of an hereditary religion. Is this human nature, or is it not? Is it a natural or an unnatural feeling for the representative of an ancient Roman Catholic family, even if in his heart he rejected the controverted tenets of his early faith, to scorn an open conformity to ours, so long as such conformity brings with it the irremovable suspicion that faith and conscience may have bowed to the base hope of temporal advantage? Every man must feel and act for himself: but, in my opinion, a good man might be put to difficulty to determine whether more harm is not done by the example of one changing his religion to his worldly advantage, than good, by his openly professing conformity from what we think error to what we think truth."—(*Lord Nugent's Letter*, pp. 54, 55.)

"We will not be bullied out of the Catholic question." This is a very common text, and requires some comment. If you mean that the sense of personal dagner shall never prevent you from doing what you think right—this is a worthy and proper feeling, but no such motive is suspected, and no such question is at issue. Nobody doubts but that any English gentleman would be ready to join his No Popery corps, and to do his duty to the community, if the Government required it; but the question is, Is it worth while in the Government to require it? Is it for the general advantage that such a war should be carried on for such an object? It is a question not of personal valour, but of political expediency. Decide seriously if it be worth the price of civil war to exclude the Catholics, and act accordingly; taking it for granted that you possess, and that everybody supposes you to

possess, the vulgar attribute of personal courage ; but do not draw your sword like a fool, from the unfounded apprehension of being called a coward.

We have great hopes of the Duke of Clarence. Whatever else he may be, he is not a bigot — not a person who thinks it necessary to show respect to his royal father, by prolonging the miseries and incapacities of six millions of people. If he ascend the throne of these realms, he must stand the fire of a few weeks' clamour and unpopularity. If the measure be passed by the end of May, we can promise his Royal Highness it will utterly be forgotten before the end of June. Of all human nonsense, it is surely the greatest to talk of respect to the late king — respect to the memory of the Duke of York — by not voting for the Catholic question. Bad enough to burn widows when the husband dies— bad enough to burn horses, dogs, butlers, footmen, and coachmen, on the funeral pile of a Scythian warrior — but to offer up the happiness of seven millions of people to the memory of the dead, is certainly the most insane sepulchral oblation of which history makes mention. The best compliment to these deceased princes, is to remember their real good qualities, and to forget (as soon as we can forget it) that these good qualities were tarnished by limited and mistaken views of religious liberty.

Persecuting gentlemen forget the expense of persecution ; whereas, of all luxuries, it is the most expensive. The Ranters do not cost us a farthing, because they are not disqualified by ranting. The Methodists and Unitarians are gratis. The Irish Catholics, supposing every alternate year to be war, as it has been for the last century, will cost us, within these next twenty years, forty millions of money. There are 20,000 soldiers there in time of peace ; in war, including the militia, their numbers will be doubled — and there must be a very formidable fleet in addition. Now, when the tax paper comes round, and we are to make a return of the greatest number of horses, buggies, ponies, dogs, cats, bullfinches, and canary birds, &c., and to be taxed accordingly, let us remember how well and wisely our money has been spent, and not repine that we have purchased, by severe taxation, the high and exalted pleasures of intolerance and persecution.

It is mere unsupported, and unsupportable nonsense, to talk of the exclusive disposition of the Catholics to persecute. The Protestants have murdered, and tortured, and laid waste as much as the Catholics. Each party, as it gained the upper hand, tried death as the remedy for heresy — both parties have tried it in vain.

A distinction is set up between civil rights and political power, and applied against the Catholics : the real difference between these two words is, that civil comes from a Latin word, and political from a Greek one ; but if there be any difference in their meaning, the Catholics do not ask for political power, but for *eligibility* to political power. The Catholics have never prayed, or dreamt of praying, that so many of the Judges and King's Counsel should necessarily be Catholics ; but that no law should exist which prevented them from becoming so, if a Protestant King chose to make them so. Eligibility to political power is a civil privilege, of which we have no more right to deprive any man than of any other civil privilege. The good of the State may require that all civil rights may be taken from Catholics ; but to say that eligibility to political power is not a civil right, and that to take it away without grave cause, would not be a gross act of injustice, is mere declamation. Besides, what is called political power, and what are called civil rights, are given or withholden, without the least reference to any principle, but by mere caprice. A right of voting is given — this is political power ; eligibility to the office of Alderman or Bank Director is refused — this is a civil right : the distinction is perpetually violated, just as it has suited the state of parties for the moment. And here a word or two on the manner of handling the question. Because some offices might

be filled with Catholics, all would be: this is one topic. A second is, because there might be inconvenience from a Catholic King or Chancellor, that, therefore, there would be inconvenience from Catholic Judges or Sergeants. In talking of establishments, they always take care to blend the Irish and English establishments, and never to say which is meant, though the circumstances of both are as different as possible. It is always presumed, that sects holding opinions contrary to the Establishment, are *hostile* to the Establishment; meaning by the word hostile, that they are combined, or ready to combine, for its destruction. It is contended, that the Catholics would not be satisfied by these concessions; meaning, thereby, that many would not be so — but forgetting to add, that many *would* be quite satisfied — all *more* satisfied, and less likely to run into rebellion. It is urged that the mass of Catholics are indifferent to the question; whereas (never mind the cause) there is not a Catholic plough-boy, at this moment, who is not ready to risk his life for it, nor a Protestant stable-boy, who does not give himself airs of superiority over any papistical cleaner of horses, who is scrubbing with him under the same roof.

The Irish were quiet under the severe code of Queen Anne — so the half-murdered man left on the ground bleeding by thieves is quiet; and he only moans, and cries for help as he recovers. There was a method which would have made the Irish still more quiet, and effectually have put an end to all further solicitation respecting the Catholic question. It was adopted in the case of the wolves.

They are forming societies in Ireland for the encouragement of emigration, and striving, and successfully striving, to push their redundant population into Great Britain. Our business is to pacify Ireland — to give confidence to capitalists — and to keep their people where they are. On the day the Catholic question was passed, all property in Ireland would rise 20 per cent.

Protestants admit that there are sectaries sitting in Parliament, who differ from the Church of England as much as the Catholics; but it is forgotten that, according to the doctrine of the Church of England, the Unitarians are considered as condemned to eternal punishment in another world — and that many such have seats in Parliament. And can anything be more preposterous (as far as doctrine has any influence in these matters) than that men, whom we believe to be singled out as objects of God's eternal vengeance, should have a seat in our national councils; and that Catholics, whom we believe may be saved, should not?

The only argument which has any *appearance of weight*, is the question of divided allegiance; and, generally speaking, we should say it is the argument which produces the greatest effect in the country at large. England, in this respect, is in the same state, at least, as the whole of Catholic Europe. Is not the allegiance of every French, every Spanish, and every Italian Catholic (who is not a Roman) divided? His king is in Paris, or Madrid, or Naples, while his high-priest is at Rome. We speak of it as an anomaly in politics; whereas, it is the state, and condition of almost the whole of Europe. The danger of this divided allegiance, they admit, is nothing as long as it is confined to purely spiritual concerns; but it may extend itself to temporal matters, and so endanger the safety of the State. This danger, however, is greater in a Catholic than in a Protestant country; not only on account of the greater majority upon whom it might act; but because there are objects in a Catholic country much more desirable, and attainable, than in a country like England, where Popery does not exist, or Ireland, where it is humbled, and impoverished. Take, for instance, the freedom of the Gallican Church. What eternal disputes did this object give birth to! What a temptation to the Pope to infringe in rich Catholic countries! How is it possible his Holiness can keep his hands from picking and stealing? It

must not be imagined that Catholicism has been any defence against the hostility and aggression of the Pope: he has cursed and excommunicated every Catholic State in Europe, in their turns. Let that eminent Protestant, Lord Bathurst, state any one instance where, for the last century, the Pope has interfered with the temporal concerns of Great Britain. We can mention, and his Lordship will remember, innumerable instances where he might have done so, if such were the modern habit and policy of the Court of Rome. But the fact is, there is no Court of Rome, and no Pope. There is a wax-work Pope, and a wax-work Court of Rome. But Popes of flesh and blood have long since disappeared; and in the same way, those great giants of the city exist no more, but their truculent images are at Guildhall. We doubt if there is in the treasury of the Pope, change for a guinea — we are sure there is not in his armoury one gun which will go off. We believe, if he attempted to bless anybody whom Dr. Doyle cursed, or to curse anybody whom Dr. Doyle blessed, that his blessings and curses would be as powerless as his artillery. Dr. Doyle* is the Pope of Ireland; and the ablest ecclesiastic of that country will always be its Pope — and that Lord Bathurst ought to know—most likely does know. But what a waste of life and time, to combat such arguments! Can my Lord Bathurst be ignorant?—can any man, who has the slightest knowledge of Ireland, be ignorant, that the portmanteau which sets out every quarter for Rome, and returns from it, is a heap of ecclesiastical matters, which have no more to do with the safety of the country, than they have to do with the safety of the moon — and which, but for the respect to individual feelings, might all be published at Charing Cross? Mrs. *Flanagan*, intimidated by stomach complaints, wants a dispensation for eating flesh. *Cornelius Oh Bowel* has intermarried by accident with his grandmother; and, finding that she is really his grandmother, his conscience is uneasy. *Mr. Mac Tooley*, the priest, is discovered to be married, and to have two sons, *Castor* and *Pollux Mac Tooley*. Three or four schools-full of little boys have been cursed for going to hear a Methodist preacher. Bargains for shirts and toe-nails of deceased saints—surplices and trencher-caps blessed by the Pope. These are the fruits of double allegiance — the objects of our incredible fear, and the cause of our incredible folly. There is not a syllable which goes to or comes from the Court of Rome, which, by a judicious expenditure of sixpence by the year, would not be open to the examination of every Member of the Cabinet. Those who use such arguments know the answer to them as well as we do. The real evil they dread is the destruction of the Church of Ireland, and through that, of the Church of England. To which we reply, that such danger must proceed from the regular proceedings of Parliament, or be effected by insurrection and rebellion. The Catholics, restored to civil functions, would, we believe, be more likely to cling to the Church than to Dissenters. If not, both Catholics and Dissenters must be utterly powerless against the overwhelming English interest and feelings in the House. Men are less inclined to run into rebellion, in proportion as they have less to complain of; and, of all other dangers, the greatest to the Irish and English Church establishments, and to the Protestant faith throughout Europe, is *to leave Ireland in its present state of discontent.*

If the intention is to wait to the last, before concession is made, till the French or Americans have landed, and the Holy standard has been unfurled, we ought to be sure of the terms which can be obtained at such a crisis. This game was played in

* "Of this I can with great truth assure you; and my testimony, if not entitled to respect, should not be utterly disregarded, that Papal influence will never induce the Catholics of this country either to continue tranquil, or to be disturbed, either to aid or to oppose the Government; and that your Lordship can contribute much more than the Pope to secure their allegiance, or to render them disaffected."—(*Dr. Doyle's Letter to Lord Liverpool*, p. 115.)

America. Commissioners were sent in one year to offer and to press what would have been most thankfully received the year before; but they were always too late. The rapid concessions of England were outstripped by the more rapid exactions of the colonies; and the commissioners returned with the melancholy history, that they had humbled themselves before the rebels in vain. If you ever mean to concede at all, do it when every concession will be received as a favour. To wait till you are forced to treat, is as mean in principle as it is dangerous in effect.

Then, how many thousand Protestant Dissenters are there who pay a double allegiance to the King, and to the head of their Church, who is not the King? Is not Mr. William Smith, member for Norwich, the head of the Unitarian Church? Is not Mr. Wilberforce the head of the Clapham Church? Are there not twenty preachers at Leeds, who regulate all the proceedings of the Methodists? The gentlemen we have mentioned are eminent, and most excellent men; but if anything at all is to be apprehended from this divided allegiance, we should be infinitely more afraid of some Jacobinical fanatic at the head of Protestant votaries — some man of such character as Lord George Gordon — than we should of all the efforts of the Pope.

As so much evil is supposed to proceed from not obeying the King as head of the Church, it might be supposed to be a very active office — that the King was perpetually interfering with the affairs of the Church — and that orders were in a course of emanation from the Throne, which regulated the fervour, and arranged the devotion of all the members of the Church of England. But we really do not know what orders are ever given by the King to the Church, except the appointment of a fast-day once in three or four years; — nor can we conceive (for appointment to Bishopries is out of the question) what duties there would be to perform, if this allegiance were paid, instead of being withholden. Supremacy appears to us to be a mere name, without exercise of power — and allegiance to be a duty, without any performance annexed. If any one will say what ought to be done which is not done, on account of this divided allegiance, we shall better understand the magnitude of the evil. Till then, we shall consider it as a lucky Protestant phrase, good to look at, like the mottos and ornaments on cake, but not fit to be eaten.

Nothing can be more unfair than to expect, in an ancient church like that of the Catholics, the same uniformity as in churches which have not existed for more than two or three centuries. The coats and waistcoats of the reign of Henry VIII. bear some resemblance to the same garments of the present day; but, as you recede, you get to the skins of wild beasts, or the fleeces of sheep, for the garments of savages. In the same way it is extremely difficult for a church, which has to do with the counsels of barbarous ages, not to be detected in some discrepancy of opinion; while in younger churches, everything is fair and fresh, and of modern date and figure; and it is not the custom among theologians to own their church in the wrong. "No religion can stand, if men, without regard to their God, and with regard only to controversy, shall rake out of the rubbish of antiquity the obsolete and quaint follies of the sectarians, and affront the majesty of the Almighty with the impudent catalogue of their devices; and it is a strong argument against the proscriptive system, that it helps to continue this shocking contest. Theologian against theologian, polemic against polemic, until the two madmen defame their common parent, and expose their common religion."—(*Grattan's Speech on the Catholic Question*, 1805.)

A good-natured and well-conditioned person has pleasure in keeping and distributing anything that is good. If he detects anything with superior flavour, he presses and invites, and is not easy till others participate;— and so it is with political and religious freedom. It is a pleasure to possess it, and a pleasure to communicate it to others. There is something shocking in the

greedy, growling, guzzling monopoly of such a blessing.

France is no longer a nation of atheists; and therefore, a great cause of offence to the Irish Roman Catholic clergy is removed. Navigation by steam renders all shores more accessible. The union among Catholics is consolidated; all the dangers of Ireland are redoubled; everything seems tending to an event fatal to England—fatal (whatever Catholics may foolishly imagine) to Ireland — and which will subject them both to the dominion of France.

Formerly a poor man might be removed from a parish if there was the slightest danger of his becoming chargeable; a hole in his coat or breeches excited suspicion. The churchwardens said, "He *has* cost us nothing, but he *may* cost us something; and we must not live even in the apprehension of evil." All this is changed; and the law now says, "Wait till you are hurt; time enough to meet the evil when it comes; you have no right to do a certain evil to others, to prevent an uncertain evil to yourselves." The Catholics, however, are told that what they *do* ask is objected to, from the fear of what they *may* ask; that they must do without that which is *reasonable*, for fear they should ask what is *unreasonable*. "I would give you a penny (says the miser to the beggar), if I was quite sure you would not ask me for half a crown."

"Nothing, I am told, is now so common on the Continent as to hear our Irish policy discussed. Till of late the extent of the disabilities was but little understood, and less regarded, partly because, having less liberty themselves, foreigners could not appreciate the deprivations, and partly because the pre-eminence of England was not so decided as to draw the eyes of the world on all parts of our system. It was scarcely credited that England, that knight-errant abroad, should play the exclusionist at home; that everywhere else she should declaim against oppression, but contemplate it without emotion at her doors. That her armies should march, and her orators philippise, and her poets sing against continental tyranny, and yet that laws should remain extant, and principles be operative within our gates, which are a bitter satire on our philanthropy, and a melancholy negation of our professions. Our sentiments have been so lofty, our deportment to foreigners so haughty, we have set up such liberty and such morals, that no one could suppose that we were hypocrites. Still less could it be foreseen that as a great moralist, called Joseph Surface, kept a 'Little Milliner' behind the screen, we too should be found out at length in taking the diversion of private tyranny after the most approved models for that amusement."—(*Letter to Lord Milton*, pp. 50, 51.)

We sincerely hope — we firmly believe—it never will happen; but if it were to happen, why cannot England be just as happy with Ireland being Catholic, as it is with Scotland being Presbyterian? Has not the Church of England lived side by side with the Kirk, without crossing or jostling, for these last hundred years? Have the Presbyterian members entered into any conspiracy for mincing Bishoprics and Deaneries into Synods and Presbyteries? And is not the Church of England tenfold more rich and more strong than when the separation took place? But however this may be, the real danger, even to the Church of Ireland, as we have before often remarked, is the refusal of Catholic Emancipation.

It would seem, from the frenzy of many worthy Protestants, whenever the name of Catholic is mentioned, that the greatest possible diversity of religious opinions existed between the Catholic and the Protestant—that they were as different as fish and flesh — as alkali and acid — as cow and carthorse; whereas it is quite clear, that there are many Protestant sects whose difference from each other is much more marked, both in church discipline and in tenets of faith, than that of Protestants and Catholics. We maintain that Lambeth, in these two points, is quite as near to the Vatican as it is to the Kirk—if not much nearer.

Instead of lamenting the power of the priests over the lower orders of the Irish, we ought to congratulate ourselves that any influence can effect or control them. Is the tiger less formidable in the forest than when he has

been caught and taught to obey a voice, and tremble at a hand? But we overrate the power of the priest, if we suppose that the upper orders are to encounter all the dangers of treason and rebellion, to confer the revenues of the Protestant Church upon their Catholic clergy. If the influence of the Catholic clergy upon men of rank and education is so unbounded, why cannot the French and Italian clergy recover their possessions, or acquire an equivalent for them? They are starving in the full enjoyment of an influence which places (as we think) all the wealth and power of the country at their feet—an influence which, in our opinion, overpowers avarice, fear, ambition, and is the master of every passion which brings on change and movement in the Protestant world.

We conclude with a few words of advice to the different opponents of the Catholic question.

To the No-Popery Fool.

You are made use of by men who laugh at you, and despise you for your folly and ignorance; and who, the moment it suits their purpose, will consent to emancipation of the Catholics, and leave you to roar and bellow No Popery! to Vacancy and the Moon.

To the No-Popery Rogue.

A shameful and scandalous game, to sport with the serious interests of the country, in order to gain some increase of public power!

To the Honest No-Popery People.

We respect you very sincerely—but are astonished at your existence.

To the Base.

Sweet children of turpitude, beware! the old anti-popery people are fast perishing away. Take heed that you are not surprised by an emancipating king, or an emancipating administration. Leave a *locus pœnitentiæ!*—prepare a place for retreat—get ready your equivocations and denials. The dreadful day may yet come, when liberality may lead to place and power. We understand these matters here. It is safest to be moderately base—to be flexible in shame, and to be always ready for what is generous, good, and just, when anything is to be gained by virtue.

To the Catholics.

Wait. Do not add to your miseries by a mad and desperate rebellion. Persevere in civil exertions, and concede all you can concede. All great alterations in human affairs are produced by compromise.

NOTE.

Mr. Sydney Smith selected from the Edinburgh Review those articles he had written,—with the exception of twelve.

These were *probably* omitted, because their subjects are already treated of in the extracted Articles, or, because they applied *only* to the period in which they were written.

As Mr. Sydney Smith *made* the selection, it is therefore respected and continued; but lest any intention of disowning these omissions should be inferred, their numbers are subjoined.*

After the year 1827, the Lord Chancellor Lyndhurst, disregarding political differences between himself and his friend, presented Mr. Sydney Smith to the Canonry of Bristol Cathedral. As a Dignitary of the Church he then ceased to write anonymously.

* Vol. i. No. 3.; Vol. ii. No. 4.; Vol. iii. Nos. 12. and 7.; Vol. xii. No. 5.; Vol. xvi. No. 7.; Vol. xvii. No. 4.; Vol. xxxii. No. 6.; Vol. xxxiv. Nos. 5. and 8.; Vol. xxxvii. No. 2.; and Vol. xl. No. 2.

LETTERS

ON THE SUBJECT OF

THE CATHOLICS

TO

MY BROTHER ABRAHAM

WHO LIVES IN THE COUNTRY.

BY PETER PLYMLEY.

LETTER I.

Dear Abraham,

A worthier and better man than yourself does not exist; but I have always told you from the time of our boyhood, that you were a bit of a goose. Your parochial affairs are governed with exemplary order and regularity; you are as powerful in the vestry as Mr. Perceval is in the House of Commons,—and, I must say, with much more reason; nor do I know any church where the faces and smock-frocks of the congregation are so clean, or their eyes so uniformly directed to the preacher. There is another point, upon which I will do you ample justice; and that is, that the eyes so directed towards you are wide open; for the rustic has, in general, good principles, though he cannot control his animal habits; and, however loud he may snore, his face is perpetually turned toward the fountain of orthodoxy.

Having done you this act of justice, I shall proceed, according to our ancient intimacy and familiarity, to explain to you my opinions about the Catholics, and to reply to yours.

In the first place, my sweet Abraham, the Pope is not landed — nor are there any curates sent out after him — nor has he been hid at St. Alban's by the Dowager Lady Spencer — nor dined privately at Holland House—nor been seen near Dropmore. If these fears exist (which I do not believe), they exist only in the mind of the Chancellor of the Exchequer; they emanate from his zeal for the Protestant interest; and, though they reflect the highest honour upon the delicate irritability of his faith, must certainly be considered as more ambiguous proofs of the sanity and vigour of his understanding. By this time, however, the best informed clergy in the neighbourhood of the metropolis are convinced that the rumour is without foundation: and, though the Pope is probably hovering about our coast in a fishing smack, it is most likely he will fall a prey to the vigilance of our cruisers; and it is certain he has not yet polluted the Protestantism of our soil.

Exactly in the same manner, the story of the wooden gods seized at Charing Cross, by an order from the

Foreign Office, turns out to be without the shadow of a foundation: instead of the angels and archangels, mentioned by the informer, nothing was discovered but a wooden image of Lord Mulgrave, going down to Chatham, as a head-piece for the Spanker gun-vessel: it was an exact resemblance of his Lordship in his military uniform; and *therefore* as little like a god as can well be imagined.

Having set your fears at rest, as to the extent of the conspiracy formed against the Protestant religion, I will now come to the argument itself.

You say these men interpret the Scriptures in an unorthodox manner, and that they eat their God.—Very likely. All this may seem very important to you, who live fourteen miles from a market town, and, from long residence upon your living, are become a kind of holy vegetable; and, in a theological sense, it is highly important. But I want soldiers and sailors for the state; I want to make a greater use than I now can do of a poor country full of men; I want to render the military service popular among the Irish; to check the power of France; to make every possible exertion for the safety of Europe, which in twenty years' time will be nothing but a mass of French slaves: and then you, and ten other such boobies as you, call out —"For God's sake, do not think of raising cavalry and infantry in Ireland! . . . . They interpret the Epistle to Timothy in a different manner from what we do! . . . . They eat a bit of wafer every Sunday, which they call their God!" . . . . I wish to my soul they would eat you, and such reasoners as you are. What! when Turk, Jew, Heretic, Infidel, Catholic, Protestant, are all combined against this country; when men of every religious persuasion, and no religious persuasion; when the population of half the globe is up in arms against us; are we to stand examining our generals and armies as a bishop examines a candidate for holy orders? and to suffer no one to bleed for England who does not agree with you about the 2nd of Timothy? You talk about Catholics! If you and your brotherhood have been able to persuade the country into a continuation of this grossest of all absurdities, you have ten times the power which the Catholic clergy ever had in their best days. Louis XIV., when he revoked the Edict of Nantes, never thought of preventing the Protestants from fighting his battles; and gained accordingly some of his most splendid victories by the talents of his Protestant generals. No power in Europe, but yourselves, has ever thought for these hundred years past, of asking whether a bayonet is Catholic, or Presbyterian, or Lutheran; but whether it is sharp and well-tempered. A bigot delights in public ridicule; for he begins to think he is a martyr. I can promise you the full enjoyment of this pleasure, from one extremity of Europe to the other.

I am as disgusted with the nonsense of the Roman Catholic religion as you can be: and no man who talks such nonsense shall ever tithe the product of the earth, nor meddle with the ecclesiastical establishment in any shape; —but what have I to do with the speculative nonsense of his theology, when the object is to elect the mayor of a county town, or to appoint a colonel of a marching regiment? Will a man discharge the solemn impertinences of the one office with less zeal, or shrink from the bloody boldness of the other with greater timidity, because the blockhead believes in all the Catholic nonsense of the real presence? I am sorry there should be such impious folly in the world, but I should be ten times a greater fool than he is, if I refused, in consequence of his folly, to lead him out against the enemies of the state. Your whole argument is wrong: the state has nothing whatever to do with theological errors which do not violate the common rules of morality, and militate against the fair power of the ruler: it leaves all these errors to you, and to such as you. You have every tenth porker in your parish for refuting them; and take care that you are vigilant, and logical in the task.

I love the Church as well as you do; but you totally mistake the nature of an establishment, when you contend

that it ought to be connected with the military and civil career of every individual in the state. It is quite right that there should be one clergyman to every parish interpreting the Scriptures after a particular manner, ruled by a regular hierarchy, and paid with a rich proportion of haycocks and wheat-sheafs. When I have laid this foundation for a rational religion in the state—when I have placed ten thousand well educated men in different parts of the kingdom to preach it up, and compelled everybody to pay them, whether they hear them or not—I have taken such measures as I know must always procure an immense majority in favour of the Established Church; but I can go no further. I cannot set up a civil inquisition, and say to one, you shall not be a butcher, because you are not orthodox; and prohibit another from brewing, and a third from administering the law, and a fourth from defending the country. If common justice did not prohibit me from such a conduct, common sense would. The advantage to be gained by quitting the heresy would make it shameful to abandon it; and men who had once left the Church would continue in such a state of alienation from a point of honour, and transmit that spirit to the latest posterity. This is just the effect your disqualifying laws have produced. They have fed Dr. Rees, and Dr. Kippis; crowded the congregation of the Old Jewry to suffocation; and enabled every sublapsarian, and superlapsarian, and semi-pelagian clergyman, to build himself a neat brick chapel, and live with some distant resemblance to the state of a gentleman.

You say the King's coronation oath will not allow him to consent to any relaxation of the Catholic laws.—Why not relax the Catholic laws as well as the laws against Protestant dissenters? If one is contrary to his oath, the other must be so too; for the spirit of the oath is, to defend the Church establishment, which the Quaker and the Presbyterian differ from as much or more than the Catholic; and yet his Majesty has repealed the Corporation and Test Act in Ireland, and done more for the Catholics of both kingdoms than had been done for them since the Reformation. In 1778, the ministers said nothing about the royal conscience; in 1793* no conscience; in 1804 no conscience; the common feeling of humanity and justice then seem to have had their fullest influence upon the advisers of the Crown: but in 1807—a year, I suppose, eminently fruitful in moral and religious scruples (as some years are fruitful in apples, some in hops)—it is contended by the well-paid John Bowles, and by Mr. Perceval (who tried to be well paid), that that is now perjury which we had hitherto called policy and benevolence! Religious liberty has never made such a stride as under the reign of his present Majesty; nor is there any instance in the annals of our history, where so many infamous and damnable laws have been repealed as those against the Catholics which have been put an end to by him: and then, at the close of this useful policy, his advisers discover that the very measures of concession and indulgence, or (to use my own language) the measures of justice, which he has been pursuing through the whole of his reign, are contrary to the oath he takes at its commencement! That oath binds his Majesty not to consent to any measure contrary to the interest of the Established Church: but who is to judge of the tendency of each particular measure? Not the King alone: it can never be the intention of this law that the King, who listens to the advice of his Parliament upon a road bill, should reject it upon the most important of all measures. Whatever be his own private judgment of the tendency of any ecclesiastical bill, he complies most strictly with his oath, if he is guided in that particular point by the advice of his Parliament, who may be presumed to understand its tendency better than the King, or any other individual. You say, if Parliament had been unanimous in their

* These feelings of humanity and justice were at some periods a little quickened by the representations of 40,000 armed volunteers.

opinion of the absolute necessity for Lord Howick's bill, and the King had thought it pernicious, he would have been perjured if he had not rejected it. I say, on the contrary, his Majesty would have acted in the most conscientious manner, and have complied most scrupulously with his oath, if he had sacrificed his own opinion to the opinion of the great council of the nation; because the probability was that such opinion was better than his own: and upon the same principle, in common life, you give up your opinion to your physician, your lawyer, and your builder.

You admit this bill did not compel the King to elect Catholic officers, but only gave him the option of doing so if he pleased; but you add, that the King was right in not trusting such dangerous power to himself or his successors. Now you are either to suppose that the King for the time being has a zeal for the Catholic establishment, or that he has not. If he has not, where is the danger of giving such an option? If you suppose that he may be influenced by such an admiration of the Catholic religion, why did his present Majesty, in the year 1804, consent to that bill which empowered the Crown to station ten thousand Catholic soldiers in any part of the kingdom, and placed them absolutely at the disposal of the Crown? If the King of England for the time being is a good Protestant, there can be no danger in making the Catholic *eligible* to anything: if he is not, no power can possibly be so dangerous as that conveyed by the bill last quoted; to which, in point of peril, Lord Howick's bill is a mere joke. But the real fact is, one bill opened a door to his Majesty's advisers for trick, jobbing, and intrigue; the other did not.

Besides, what folly to talk to me of an oath, which, under all possible circumstances, is to prevent the relaxation of the Catholic laws! for such a solemn appeal to God sets all conditions and contingencies at defiance. Suppose Bonaparte was to retrieve the only very great blunder he has made, and were to succeed, after repeated trials, in making an impression upon Ireland, do you think we should hear anything of the impediment of a coronation oath? or would the spirit of this country tolerate for an hour such ministers, and such unheard-of nonsense, if the most distant prospect existed of conciliating the Catholics by every species even of the most abject concession? And yet, if your argument is good for anything, the coronation oath ought to reject, at such a moment, every tendency to conciliation, and to bind Ireland for ever to the crown of France.

I found in your letter the usual remarks about fire, fagot, and bloody Mary. Are you aware, my dear Priest, that there were as many persons put to death for religious opinions under the mild Elizabeth as under the bloody Mary? The reign of the former was, to be sure, ten times as long, but I only mention the fact, merely to show you that something depends upon the age in which men live, as well as on their religious opinions. Three hundred years ago, men burnt and hanged each other for these opinions. Time has softened Catholic as well as Protestant: they both required it; though each perceives only his own improvement, and is blind to that of the other. We are all the creatures of circumstances. I know not a kinder and better man than yourself; but you (if you had lived in those times) would certainly have roasted your Catholic: and I promise you, if the first exciter of this religious mob had been as powerful then as he is now, you would soon have been elevated to the mitre. I do not go to the length of saying that the world has suffered as much from Protestant as from Catholic persecution; far from it: but you should remember the Catholics had all the power, when the idea first started up in the world that there could be two modes of faith; and that it was much more natural they should attempt to crush this diversity of opinion by great and cruel efforts, than that the Protestants should rage against those who differed from them, when the very basis of their system was complete freedom in all spiritual matters.

I cannot extend my letter any further at present, but you shall soon hear from me again. You tell me I am a party man. I hope I shall always be so, when I see my country in the hands of a pert London joker and a second-rate lawyer. Of the first, no other good is known than that he makes pretty Latin verses; the second seems to me to have the head of a country parson, and the tongue of an Old Bailey lawyer.

If I could see good measures pursued, I care not a farthing who is in power; but I have a passionate love for common justice, and for common sense, and I abhor and despise every man who builds up his political fortune upon their ruin.

God bless you, reverend Abraham, and defend you from the Pope, and all of us from that administration who seek power by opposing a measure which Burke, Pitt, and Fox all considered as absolutely necessary to the existence of the country.

LETTER II.

Dear Abraham,

The Catholic not respect an oath! why not? What upon earth has kept him out of Parliament, or excluded him from all the offices whence he is excluded, but his respect for oaths? There is no law which prohibits a Catholic to sit in Parliament. There could be no such law; because it is impossible to find out what passes in the interior of any man's mind. Suppose it were in contemplation to exclude all men from certain offices who contended for the legality of taking tithes: the only mode of discovering that fervid love of decimation which I know you to possess would be to tender you an oath against that damnable doctrine, that it is lawful for a spiritual man to take, abstract, appropriate, subduct, or lead away the tenth calf, sheep, lamb, ox, pigeon, duck, &c. &c. &c., and every other animal that ever existed, which of course the lawyers would take care to enumerate. Now this oath I am sure you would rather die than take; and so the Catholic is excluded from Parliament because he will not swear that he disbelieves the leading doctrines of his religion! The Catholic asks you to abolish some oaths which oppress him; your answer is, that he does not respect oaths. Then why subject him to the test of oaths? The oaths keep him out of Parliament; why, then, he respects them. Turn which way you will, either your laws are nugatory, or the Catholic is bound by religious obligations as you are: but no eel in the well-sanded fist of a cook-maid, upon the eve of being skinned, ever twisted and writhed as an orthodox parson does when he is compelled by the gripe of reason to admit anything in favour of a Dissenter.

I will not dispute with you whether the Pope be or be not the Scarlet Lady of Babylon. I hope it is not so; because I am afraid it will induce his Majesty's Chancellor of the Exchequer to introduce several severe bills against popery, if that is the case; and though he will have the decency to appoint a previous committee of inquiry as to the fact, the committee will be garbled and the report inflammatory. Leaving this to be settled as he pleases to settle it, I wish to inform you, that previously to the bill last passed in favour of the Catholics, at the suggestion of Mr. Pitt, and for his satisfaction, the opinions of six of the most celebrated of the foreign Catholic universities were taken as to the right of the Pope to interfere in the temporal concerns of any country. The answer cannot possibly leave the shadow of a doubt, even in the mind of Baron Maseres; and Dr. Rennel would be compelled to admit it, if three Bishops lay dead at the very moment the question were put to him. To this answer might be added also the solemn declaration and signature of all the Catholics in Great Britain.

I should perfectly agree with you, if the Catholics admitted such a dangerous dispensing power in the hands of the Pope; but they all deny it, and laugh at it, and are ready to abjure it in the most decided manner you can

devise. They obey the Pope as the spiritual head of their church; but are you really so foolish as to be imposed upon by mere names?—What matters it the seven thousandth part of a farthing who is the spiritual head of any church? Is not Mr. Wilberforce at the head of the church of Clapham? Is not Dr. Letsom at the head of the Quaker church? Is not the General Assembly at the head of the church of Scotland? How is the government disturbed by these many-headed churches? or in what way is the power of the Crown augmented by this almost nominal dignity?

The King appoints a fast day once a year, and he makes the Bishops: and if the government would take half the pains to keep the Catholics out of the arms of France that it does to widen Temple Bar, or improve Snow Hill, the King would get into his hands the appointments of the titular Bishops of Ireland.—Both Mr. C——'s sisters enjoy pensions more than sufficient to place the two greatest dignitaries of the Irish Catholic Church entirely at the disposal of the Crown.—Everybody who knows Ireland knows perfectly well, that nothing would be easier, with the expenditure of a little money, than to preserve enough of the ostensible appointment in the hands of the Pope to satisfy the scruples of the Catholics, while the real nomination remained with the Crown. But, as I have before said, the moment the very name of Ireland is mentioned, the English seem to bid adieu to common feeling, common prudence, and common sense, and to act with the barbarity of tyrants, and the fatuity of idiots.

Whatever your opinion may be of the follies of the Roman Catholic religion, remember they are the follies of four millions of human beings, increasing rapidly in numbers, wealth, and intelligence, who, if firmly united with this country, would set at defiance the power of France, and if once wrested from their alliance with England, would in three years render its existence as an independent nation absolutely impossible. You speak of danger to the Establishment: I request to know when the Establishment was ever so much in danger as when Hoche was in Bantry Bay, and whether all the books of Bossuet, or the arts of the Jesuits, were half so terrible? Mr. Perceval and his parsons forgot all this, in their horror lest twelve or fourteen old women may be converted to holy water, and Catholic nonsense. They never see that, while they are saving these venerable ladies from perdition, Ireland may be lost, England broken down, and the Protestant Church, with all its deans, prebendaries, Percevals and Rennels, be swept into the vortex of oblivion.

Do not, I beseech you, ever mention to me again the name of Dr. Duigenan. I have been in every corner of Ireland, and have studied its present strength and condition with no common labour. Be assured Ireland does not contain at this moment less than five millions of people. There were returned in the year 1791 to the hearth tax 701,000 houses, and there is no kind of question that there were about 50,000 houses omitted in that return. Taking, however, only the number returned for the tax, and allowing the average of six to a house (a very small average for a potato-fed people), this brings the population to 4,200,000 people in the year 1791: and it can be shown from the clearest evidence (and Mr. Newenham in his book shows it), that Ireland for the last fifty years has increased in its population at the rate of 50,000 or 60,000 per annum; which leaves the present population of Ireland at about five millions, after every possible deduction for *existing circumstances, just and necessary wars, monstrous and unnatural rebellions*, and all other sources of human destruction. Of this population, two out of ten are Protestants; and the half of the Protestant population are Dissenters, and as inimical to the Church as the Catholics themselves. In this state of things, thumbscrews and whipping—admirable engines of policy, as they must be considered to be—will not ultimately avail. The Catholics will hang over you; they will watch for the moment, and compel you hereafter to give them ten times as

much, against your will, as they would now be contented with, if it were voluntarily surrendered. Remember what happened in the American war; when Ireland compelled you to give her everything she asked, and to renounce, in the most explicit manner, your claim of sovereignty over her. God Almighty grant the folly of these present men may not bring on such another crisis of public affairs!

What are your dangers which threaten the Establishment?—Reduce this declamation to a point, and let us understand what you mean. The most ample allowance does not calculate that there would be more than twenty members who were Roman Catholics in one house, and ten in the other, if the Catholic emancipation were carried into effect. Do you mean that these thirty members would bring in a bill to take away the tithes from the Protestant, and to pay them to the Catholic clergy? Do you mean that a Catholic general would march his army into the House of Commons and purge it of Mr. Perceval and Dr. Duigenan? or, that the theological writers would become all of a sudden more acute and more learned, if the present civil incapacities were removed? Do you fear for your tithes, or your doctrines, or your person, or the English Constitution? Every fear, taken separately, is so glaringly absurd, that no man has the folly or the boldness to state it. Every one conceals his ignorance, or his baseness, in a stupid general panic, which, when called on, he is utterly incapable of explaining. Whatever you think of the Catholics, there they are—you cannot get rid of them; your alternative is, to give them a lawful place for stating their grievances, or an unlawful one: if you do not admit them to the House of Commons, they will hold their parliament in Potato-place, Dublin, and be ten times as violent and inflammatory as they would be in Westminster. Nothing would give me such an idea of security, as to see twenty or thirty Catholic gentlemen in Parliament, looked upon by all the Catholics as the fair and proper organ of their party. I should have thought it the height of good fortune that such a wish existed on their part, and the very essence of madness and ignorance to reject it. Can you murder the Catholics?—Can you neglect them? They are too numerous for both these expedients. What remains to done is obvious to every human being—but to that man who, instead of being a Methodist preacher, is, for the curse of us and our children, and for the ruin of Troy, and the misery of good old Priam and his sons, become a legislator and a politician.

A distinction, I perceive, is taken, by one of the most feeble noblemen in Great Britain, between persecution and the deprivation of political power; whereas there is no more distinction between these two things than there is between him who makes the distinction and a booby. If I strip off the relic-covered jacket of a Catholic, and give him twenty stripes . . . . I persecute: if I say, Everybody in the town where you live shall be a candidate for lucrative and honourable offices but you, who are a Catholic . . . . I do not persecute!—What barbarous nonsense is this! as if degradation was not as great an evil as bodily pain, or as severe poverty: as if I could not be as great a tyrant by saying, You shall not enjoy—as by saying, You shall suffer. The English, I believe, are as truly religious as any nation in Europe; I know no greater blessing: but it carries with it this evil in its train—that any villain who will bawl out "*The Church is in danger!*" may get a place and a good pension; and that any administration who will do the same thing may bring a set of men into power who, at a moment of stationary and passive piety, would be hooted by the very boys in the streets. But it is not all religion; it is, in great part, the narrow and exclusive spirit which delights to keep the common blessings of sun, and air, and freedom, from other human beings. "Your religion has always been degraded; you are in the dust, and I will take care you never rise again. I should enjoy less the possession of an earthly good, by every additional person to whom it

was extended." You may not be aware of it yourself, most reverend Abraham, but you deny their freedom to the Catholics upon the same principle that Sarah your wife refuses to give the receipt for a ham or a gooseberry dumpling: she values her receipts, not because they secure to her a certain flavour, but because they remind her that her neighbours want it:—a feeling laughable in a priestess, shameful in a priest; venial when it withholds the blessings of a ham, tyrannical and execrable when it narrows the boon of religious freedom.

You spend a great deal of ink about the character of the present prime minister. Grant you all that you write—I say, I fear he will ruin Ireland, and pursue a line of policy destructive to the true interest of his country: and then you tell me, he is faithful to Mrs. Perceval, and kind to the Master Percevals! These are, undoubtedly, the first qualifications to be looked to in a time of the most serious public danger; but somehow or another (if public and private virtues must always be incompatible), I should prefer that he destroyed the domestic happiness of Wood or Cockell, owed for the veal of the preceding year, whipped his boys, and saved his country.

The late administration did not do right; they did not build their measures upon the solid basis of facts. They should have caused several Catholics to have been dissected after death by surgeons of either religion, and the report to have been published with accompanying plates. If the viscera, and other organs of life, had been found to be the same as in Protestant bodies; if the provisions of nerves, arteries, cerebrum, and cerebellum, had been the same as we are provided with, or as the Dissenters are now known to possess; then, indeed, they might have met Mr. Perceval upon a proud eminence, and convinced the country at large of the strong probability that the Catholics are really human creatures, endowed with the feelings of men, and entitled to all their rights. But instead of this wise and prudent measure, Lord Howick, with his usual precipitation, brings forward a bill in their favour, without offering the slightest proof to the country that they were anything more than horses and oxen. The person who shows the lama at the corner of Piccadilly has the precaution to write up—*Allowed by Sir Joseph Banks to be a real quadruped*: so his Lordship might have said—*Allowed by the Bench of Bishops to be real human creatures* . . . . . I could write you twenty letters upon this subject; but I am tired, and so I suppose are you. Our friendship is now of forty years' standing: you know me to be a truly religious man; but I shudder to see religion treated like a cockade, or a pint of beer, and made the instrument of a party. I love the King, but I love the people as well as the King; and if I am sorry to see his old age molested, I am much more sorry to see four millions of Catholics baffled in their just expectations. If I love Lord Grenville and Lord Howick, it is because they love their country: if I abhor * * * * * *, it is because I know there is but one man among them who is not laughing at the enormous folly and credulity of the country, and that he is an ignorant and mischievous bigot. As for the light and frivolous jester of whom it is your misfortune to think so highly—learn, my dear Abraham, that this political Killigrew, just before the breaking-up of the last administration, was in actual treaty with them for a place; and if they had survived twenty-four hours longer, he would have been now declaiming against the cry of No Popery! instead of inflaming it.—With this practical comment on the baseness of human nature, I bid you adieu!

LETTER III.

All that I have so often told you, Mr. Abraham Plymley, is now come to pass. The Scythians, in whom you and the neighbouring country gentlemen placed such confidence, are smitten hip and thigh; their Benningsen put to open shame; their magazines of train oil intercepted—and we are waking from our disgraceful drunkenness

to all the horrors of Mr. Perceval and Mr. Canning. . . . We shall now see if a nation is to be saved by school-boy jokes and doggerel rhymes, by affronting petulance, and by the tones and gesticulations of Mr. Pitt. But these are not all the auxiliaries on which we have to depend; to these his colleague will add the strictest attention to the smaller parts of ecclesiastical government—to hassocks, to psalters, and to surplices; in the last agonies of England, he will bring in a bill to regulate Easter-offerings; and he will adjust the stipends of curates* when the flag of France is unfurled on the hills of Kent. Whatever can be done by very mistaken notions of the piety of a Christian, and by very wretched imitation of the eloquence of Mr. Pitt, will be done by these two gentlemen. After all, if they both really were what they both either wish to be or wish to be thought; if the one were an enlightened Christian, who drew from the Gospel the toleration, the charity, and the sweetness which it contains; and if the other really possessed any portion of the great understanding of his Nisus who guarded him from the weapons of the Whigs; I should still doubt if they could save us. But I am sure we are not to be saved by religious hatred and by religious trifling; by any psalmody, however sweet; or by any persecution, however sharp: I am certain the sounds of Mr. Pitt's voice, and the measure of his tones, and the movement of his arms, will do nothing for us; when these tones, and movements, and voice bring us always declamation without sense or knowledge, and ridicule without good humour or conciliation. Oh, Mr. Plymley, Mr. Plymley! this never will do. Mrs. Abraham Plymley, my sister, will be led away captive by an amorous Gaul; and Joel Plymley, your first-born, will be a French drummer.

"Out of sight, out of mind," seems to be a proverb which applies to enemies as well as friends. Because the French army was no longer seen from the cliffs of Dover; because the sound of cannon was no longer heard by the debauched London bathers on the Sussex coast; because the *Morning Post* no longer fixed the invasion sometimes for Monday, sometimes for Tuesday, sometimes (positively for the last time of invading) on Saturday; because all these causes of terror were suspended, you conceived the power of Bonaparte to be at an end, and were setting off for Paris, with Lord Hawkesbury the conqueror. — This is precisely the method in which the English have acted during the whole of the revolutionary war. If Austria or Prussia armed, doctors of divinity immediately printed those passages out of Habakkuk in which the destruction of the Usurper by General Mack and the Duke of Brunswick is so clearly predicted. If Bonaparte halted, there was a mutiny, or a dysentery. If any one of his generals was eaten up by the light troops of Russia, and picked (as their manner is) to the bone, the sanguine spirit of this country displayed itself in all its glory. What scenes of infamy did the Society for the Suppression of Vice lay open to our astonished eyes! tradesmen's daughters dancing; pots of beer carried out between the first and second lesson; and dark and distant rumours of indecent prints. Clouds of Mr. Canning's cousins arrived by the waggon; all the contractors left their cards with Mr. Rose; and every plunderer of the public crawled out of his hole, like slugs, and grubs, and worms, after a shower of rain.

If my voice could have been heard at the late changes, I should have said, "Gently; patience; stop a little; the time is not yet come; the mud of Poland will harden, and the bowels of the French grenadiers will recover their tone. When honesty, good sense, and liberality have extricated you out of your present embarrassment, then dismiss them as a matter of course; but you cannot spare them just now. Don't be in too great a hurry, or there will be no monarch to flatter and no country to pillage. Only submit for a

* The Reverend the Chancellor of the Exchequer has, since this was written, found time in the heat of the session to write a book on the Stipends of Curates.

little time to be respected abroad; overlook the painful absence of the tax-gatherer for a few years; bear up nobly under the increase of freedom and of liberal policy for a little time, and I promise you, at the expiration of that period, you shall be plundered, insulted, disgraced, and restrained to your heart's content. Do not imagine I have any intention of putting servility and canting hypocrisy permanently out of place, or of filling up with courage and sense those offices which naturally devolve upon decorous imbecility and flexible cunning: give us only a little time to keep off the hussars of France, and then the jobbers and jesters shall return to their birthright, and public virtue be called by its own name of fanaticism."* Such is the advice I would have offered to my infatuated countrymen; but it rained very hard in November, Brother Abraham, and the bowels of our enemies were loosened, and we put our trust in white fluxes and wet mud; and there is nothing now to oppose to the conqueror of the world but a small table wit, and the sallow Surveyor of the Meltings.

You ask me, if I think it possible for this country to survive the recent misfortunes of Europe?—I answer you, without the slightest degree of hesitation: that if Bonaparte lives, and a great deal is not immediately done for the conciliation of the Catholics, it does seem to me absolutely impossible but that we must perish; and take this with you, that we shall perish without exciting the slightest feeling of present or future compassion, but fall amidst the hootings and revilings of Europe, as a nation of blockheads, Methodists, and old women. If there were any great scenery, and heroic feelings, any blaze of ancient virtue, any exalted death, any termination of England that would be ever remembered, ever honoured in that western world, where liberty is now retiring, conquest would be more tolerable, and ruin more sweet; but it is doubly miserable to become slaves abroad, because we would be tyrants at home; to persecute, when we are contending against persecution; and to perish, because we have raised up worse enemies within, from our own bigotry, than we are exposed to without, from the unprincipled ambition of France. It is, indeed, a most silly and affecting spectacle to rage at such a moment against our own kindred and our own blood; to tell them they cannot be honourable in war, because they are conscientious in religion; to stipulate (at the very moment when we should buy their hearts and swords at any price) that they must hold up the right hand in prayer, and not the left; and adore one common God, by turning to the east rather than to the west.

What is it the Catholics ask of you? Do not exclude us from the honours and emoluments of the state, because we worship God in one way, and you worship him in another. In a period of the deepest peace, and the fattest prosperity, this would be a fair request: it should be granted, if Lord Hawkesbury had reached Paris, if Mr. Canning's interpreter had threatened the Senate in an opening Speech, or Mr. Perceval explained to them the improvements he meant to introduce into the Catholic religion; but to deny the Irish this justice now, in the present state of Europe, and in the summer months, just as the season for destroying kingdoms is coming on, is (beloved Abraham), whatever you may think of it, little short of positive insanity.

Here is a frigate attacked by a corsair of immense strength and size, rigging cut, masts in danger of coming by the board, four foot water in the hold, men dropping off very fast; in this dreadful situation how do you think the Captain acts (whose name shall be Perceval)? He calls all hands upon deck; talks to them of King, country, glory, sweet-

* This is Mr. Canning's term for the detection of public abuses; a term invented by him, and adopted by that simious parasite who is always grinning at his heels. Nature descends down to infinite smallness. Mr. Canning has his parasites; and if you take a large buzzing blue-bottle fly, and look at it in a microscope, you may see 20 or 30 little ugly insects crawling about it, which doubtless think their fly to be the bluest, grandest, merriest, most important animal in the universe, and are convinced the world would be at an end if it ceased to buzz.

hearts, gin, French prison, wooden shoes, Old England, and hearts of oak: they give three cheers, rush to their guns, and, after a tremendous conflict, succeed in beating off the enemy. Not a syllable of all this: this is not the manner in which the honourable Commander goes to work: the first thing he does is to secure 20 or 30 of his prime sailors who happen to be Catholics, to clap them in irons, and set over them a guard of as many Protestants; having taken this admirable method of defending himself against his infidel opponents, he goes upon deck, reminds the sailors, in a very bitter harangue, that they are of different religions; exhorts the Episcopal gunner not to trust to the Presbyterian quartermaster; issues positive orders that the Catholics should be fired at upon the first appearance of discontent; rushes through blood and brains, examining his men in the Catechism and 39 Articles, and positively forbids every one to sponge or ram who has not taken the Sacrament according to the Church of England. Was it right to take out a captain made of excellent British stuff, and to put in such a man as this? Is not he more like a parson, or a talking lawyer, than a thoroughbred seaman? And built as she is of heart of oak, and admirably manned, is it possible with such a captain, to save this ship from going to the bottom?

You have an argument, I perceive, in common with many others, against the Catholics, that their demands complied with would only lead to further exactions, and that it is better to resist them now, before anything is conceded, than hereafter, when it is found that all concessions are in vain. I wish the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who uses this reasoning to exclude others from their just rights, had tried its efficacy, not by his understanding, but by (what are full of much better things) his pockets. Suppose the person to whom he applied for the Meltings had withstood every plea of wife and fourteen children, no business, and good character, and refused him this paltry little office, because he might hereafter attempt to get hold of the revenues of the Duchy of Lancaster for life; would not Mr. Perceval have contended eagerly against the injustice of refusing moderate requests, because immoderate ones may hereafter be made? Would he not have said (and said truly), Leave such exorbitant attempts as these to the general indignation of the Commons, who will take care to defeat them when they do occur; but do not refuse me the Irons and the Meltings now, because I may totally lose sight of all moderation hereafter? Leave hereafter to the spirit and the wisdom of hereafter; and do not be niggardly now, from the apprehension that men as wise as you should be profuse in times to come.

You forget, Brother Abraham, that it is a vast art (where quarrels cannot be avoided) to turn the public opinion in your favour and to the prejudice of your enemy; a vast privilege to feel that you are in the right, and to make him feel that he is in the wrong: a privilege which makes you more than a man, and your antagonist less; and often secures victory, by convincing him who contends, that he must submit to injustice if he submits to defeat. Open every rank in the army and the navy to the Catholic; let him purchase at the same price as the Protestant (if either Catholic or Protestant can purchase such refined pleasures) the privilege of hearing Lord Castlereagh speak for three hours; keep his clergy from starving, soften some of the most odious powers of the tything-man, and you will for ever lay this formidable question to rest. But if I am wrong, and you must quarrel at last, quarrel upon just rather than unjust grounds; divide the Catholic, and unite the Protestant; be just, and your own exertions will be more formidable and their exertions less formidable; be just, and you will take away from their party all the best and wisest understandings of both persuasions, and knit them firmly to your own cause. "Thrice is he armed who has his quarrel just;" and ten times as much may he be taxed. In the beginning of any war, however destitute of common sense, every mob

will roar, and every Lord of the Bedchamber address; but if you are engaged in a war that is to last for years, and to require important sacrifices, take care to make the justice of your case so clear and so obvious, that it cannot be mistaken by the most illiterate country gentleman who rides the earth. Nothing, in fact, can be so grossly absurd as the argument which says, I will deny justice to you now, because I suspect future injustice from you. At this rate, you may lock a man up in your stable, and refuse to let him out, because you suspect that he has an intention, at some future period, of robbing your hen-roost. You may horsewhip him at Lady-day, because you believe he will affront you at Midsummer. You may commit a greater evil, to guard against a less which is merely contingent, and may never happen. You may do what you have done a century ago in Ireland, made the Catholics worse than Helots, because you suspected that they might hereafter aspire to be more than fellow-citizens; rendering their sufferings certain from your jealousy, while yours were only doubtful from their ambition; an ambition sure to be excited by the very measures which were taken to prevent it.

The physical strength of the Catholics will not be greater because you give them a share of political power. You may by these means turn rebels into friends; but I do not see how you make rebels more formidable. If they taste of the honey of lawful power, they will love the hive from whence they procure it; if they will struggle with us like men in the same state for civil influence, we are safe. All that I dread is, the physical strength of four millions of men combined with an invading French army. If you are to quarrel at last with this enormous population, still put it off as long as you can; you must gain, and cannot lose, by the delay. The state of Europe cannot be worse; the conviction which the Catholics entertain of your tyranny and injustice cannot be more alarming, nor the opinions of your own people more divided. Time, which produces such effect upon brass and marble, may inspire one Minister with modesty, and another with compassion; every circumstance may be better; some certainly will be so, none can be worse; and, after all, the evil may never happen.

You have got hold, I perceive, of all the vulgar English stories respecting the hereditary transmission of forfeited property, and seriously believe that every Catholic beggar wears the terriers of his father's land next his skin, and is only waiting for better times to cut the throat of the Protestant possessor, and get drunk in the hall of his ancestors. There is one irresistible answer to this mistake, and that is, that the forfeited lands are purchased indiscriminately by Catholic and Protestant, and that the Catholic purchaser never objects to such a title. Now the land (so purchased by a Catholic) is either his own family estate, or it is not. If it is, you suppose him so desirous of coming into possession, that he resorts to the double method of rebellion and purchase; if it is not his own family estate of which he becomes the purchaser, you suppose him first to purchase, then to rebel, in order to defeat the purchase. These things may happen in Ireland; but it is totally impossible they can happen anywhere else. In fact, what land can any man of any sect purchase in Ireland, but forfeited property? In all other oppressed countries which I have ever heard of, the rapacity of the conqueror was bounded by the territorial limits in which the objects of his avarice were contained; but Ireland has been actually confiscated twice over, as a cat is twice killed by a wicked parish boy.

I admit there is a vast luxury in selecting a particular set of Christians, and in worrying them as a boy worries a puppy dog; it is an amusement in which all the young English are brought up from their earliest days. I like the idea of saying to men who use a different hassock from me, that till they change their hassock, they shall never be Colonels, Aldermen, or Parliamentmen. While I am gratifying my personal insolence respecting religious forms, I fondle myself into an idea

that I am religious, and that I am doing my duty in the most exemplary (as I certainly am in the most easy) way. But then, my good Abraham, this sport, admirable as it is, is become, with respect to the Catholics, a little dangerous; and if we are not extremely careful in taking the amusement, we shall tumble into the holy water, and be drowned. As it seems necessary to your idea of an established Church to have somebody to worry and torment, suppose we were to select for this purpose William Wilberforce, Esq., and the patent Christians of Clapham. We shall by this expedient enjoy the same opportunity for cruelty and injustice, without being exposed to the same risks: we will compel them to abjure vital clergymen by a public test, to deny that the said William Wilberforce has any power of working miracles, touching for barrenness or any other infirmity, or that he is endowed with any preternatural gift whatever. We will swear them to the doctrine of good works, compel them to preach common sense, and to hear it; to frequent Bishops, Deans, and other high Churchmen; and to appear (once in the quarter at the least) at some melodrame, opera, pantomime, or other light scenical representation; in short, we will gratify the love of insolence and power: we will enjoy the old orthodox sport of witnessing the impotent anger of men compelled to submit to civil degradation, or to sacrifice their notions of truth to ours. And all this we may do without the slightest risk, because their numbers are (as yet) not very considerable. Cruelty and injustice must, of course, exist: but why connect them with danger? Why torture a bull-dog, when you can get a frog or a rabbit? I am sure my proposal will meet with the most universal approbation. Do not be apprehensive of any opposition from ministers. If it is a case of hatred, we are sure that one man will defend it by the Gospel: if it abridges human freedom, we know that another will find precedents for it in the Revolution.

In the name of Heaven, what are we to gain by suffering Ireland to be rode by that faction which now predominates over it? Why are we to endanger our own Church and State, not for 500,000 Episcopalians, but for ten or twelve great Orange families, who have been sucking the blood of that country for these hundred years last past? and the folly of the Orangemen* in playing this game themselves, is almost as absurd as ours in playing it for them. They ought to have the sense to see that their business now is to keep quietly the lands and beeves of which the fathers of the Catholics were robbed in days of yore; they must give to their descendants the sop of political power: by contending with them for names, they will lose realities, and be compelled to beg their potatoes in a foreign land, abhorred equally by the English, who have witnessed their oppression, and by the Catholic Irish, who have smarted under them.

LETTER IV.

THEN comes Mr. Isaac Hawkins Brown (the gentleman who danced† so badly at the Court of Naples,) and asks if it is not an anomaly to educate men in another religion than your own? It certainly is our duty to get rid of error, and above all of religious error; but this is not to be done *per saltum*, or the measure will miscarry, like the Queen. It may be very easy to dance away the royal embryo of a great kingdom; but Mr. Hawkins Brown must look before he leaps, when his object is to crush an

* This remark begins to be sensibly felt in Ireland. The Protestants in Ireland are fast coming over to the Catholic cause.

† In the third year of his present Majesty, and in the 30th of his own age, Mr. Isaac Hawkins Brown, then upon his travels, danced one evening at the Court of Naples. His dress was a volcano silk with lava buttons. Whether (as the Neapolitan wits said) he had studied dancing under St. Vitus, or whether David, dancing in a linen vest, was his model, is not known; but Mr. Brown danced with such inconceivable alacrity and vigour, that he threw the Queen of Naples into convulsions of laughter, which terminated in a miscarriage, and changed the dynasty of the Neapolitan throne.

opposite sect in religion; false steps aid the one effect, as much as they are fatal to the other: it will require not only the lapse of Mr. Hawkins Brown, but the lapse of centuries, before the absurdities of the Catholic religion are laughed at as much as they deserve to be; but surely, in the meantime, the Catholic religion is better than none; four millions of Catholics are better than four millions of wild beasts; two hundred priests educated by our own government are better than the same number educated by the man who means to destroy us.

The whole sum now appropriated by Government to the religious education of four millions of Christians is 13,000*l.*; a sum about one hundred times as large being appropriated in the same country to about one eighth part of this number of Protestants. When it was proposed to raise this grant from 8,000*l.* to 13,000*l.*, its present amount, this sum was objected to by that most indulgent of Christians, Mr. Spencer Perceval, as enormous; he himself having secured for his own eating and drinking, and the eating and drinking of the Master and Miss Percevals, the reversionary sum of 21,000*l.* a year of the public money, and having just failed in a desperate and rapacious attempt to secure to himself for life the revenues of the Duchy of Lancaster: and the best of it is, that this Minister, after abusing his predecessors for their impious bounty to the Catholics, has found himself compelled, from the apprehension of immediate danger, to grant the sum in question; thus dissolving his pearl * in vinegar, and destroying all the value of the gift by the virulence and reluctance with which it was granted.

I hear from some persons in Parliament, and from others in the sixpenny societies for debate, a great deal about unalterable laws passed at the Revolution. When I hear any man talk of an unalterable law, the only effect it produces upon me is to convince me that he is an unalterable fool. A law passed when there was Germany, Spain, Russia, Sweden, Holland, Portugal, and Turkey; when there was a disputed succession: when four or five hundred acres were won and lost after ten years' hard fighting; when armies were commanded by the sons of kings, and campaigns passed in an interchange of civil letters and ripe fruit; and for these laws, when the whole state of the world is completely changed, we are now, according to my Lord Hawkesbury, to hold ourselves ready to perish. It is no mean misfortune, in times like these, to be forced to say anything about such men as Lord Hawkesbury, and to be reminded that we are governed by them; but as I am driven to it, I must take the liberty of observing, that the wisdom and liberality of my Lord Hawkesbury are of that complexion which always shrinks from the present exercise of these virtues, by praising the splendid examples of them in ages past. If he had lived at such periods, he would have opposed the Revolution by praising the Reformation, and the Reformation by speaking handsomely of the Crusades. He gratifies his natural antipathy to great and courageous measures, by playing off the wisdom and courage which have ceased to influence human affairs against that wisdom and courage which living men would employ for present happiness. Besides, it happens unfortunately for the Warden of the Cinque Ports, that to the principal incapacities under which the Irish suffer, they were subjected after that great and glorious Revolution, to which we are indebted for so many blessings, and his Lordship for the termination of so many periods. The Catholics were not excluded from the Irish House of Commons, or military commands, before the 3rd and 4th of William and Mary, and the 1st and 2nd of Queen Anne.

If the great mass of the people, environed as they are on every side with Jenkinsons, Percevals, Melvilles, and other perils, were to pray for divine illumination and aid, what more could Providence in its mercy do than

* Perfectly ready at the same time to follow the other half of Cleopatra's example, and to swallow the solution himself.

send them the example of Scotland? For what a length of years was it attempted to compel the Scotch to change their religion: horse, foot, artillery, and armed Prebendaries, were sent out after the Presbyterian parsons and their congregations. The Percevals of those days called for blood: this call is never made in vain, and blood was shed; but to the astonishment and horror of the Percevals of those days, they could not introduce the Book of Common Prayer, nor prevent that metaphysical people from going to heaven their true way, instead of our true way. With a little oatmeal for food, and a little sulphur for friction, allaying cutaneous irritation with the one hand, and holding his Calvinistical creed in the other, Sawney ran away to his flinty hills, sung his psalm out of tune his own way, and listened to his sermon of two hours long, amid the rough and imposing melancholy of the tallest thistles. But Sawney brought up his unbreeched offspring in a cordial hatred of his oppressors; and Scotland was as much a part of the weakness of England then, as Ireland is at this moment. The true and the only remedy was applied; the Scotch were suffered to worship God after their own tiresome manner, without pain, penalty, and privation. No lightning descended from heaven; the country was not ruined; the world is not yet come to an end; the dignitaries, who foretold all these consequences, are utterly forgotten, and Scotland has ever since been an increasing source of strength to Great Britain. In the six hundredth year of our empire over Ireland, we are making laws to transport a man, if he is found out of his house after eight o'clock at night. That this is necessary, I know too well; but tell me why it is necessary? It is not necessary in Greece, where the Turks are masters.

Are you aware that there is at this moment a universal clamour throughout the whole of Ireland against the Union? It is now one month since I returned from that country; I have never seen so extraordinary, so alarming, and so rapid a change in the sentiments of any people. Those who disliked the Union before are quite furious against it now; those who doubted doubt no more: those who were friendly to it have exchanged that friendship for the most rooted aversion: in the midst of all this (which is by far the most alarming symptom), there is the strongest disposition on the part of the Northern Dissenters to unite with the Catholics, irritated by the faithless injustice with which they have been treated. If this combination does take place (mark what I say to you), you will have meetings all over Ireland for the cry of *No Union;* that cry will spread like wild-fire, and blaze over every opposition; and if this be the case, there is no use in mincing the matter, Ireland is gone, and the death-blow of England is struck; and this event may happen *instantly* — before Mr. Canning and Mr. Hookham Frere have turned Lord Howick's last speech into doggerel rhyme; before "*the near and dear relations*" have received another quarter of their pension, or Mr. Perceval conducted the Curates' Salary Bill safely to a third reading.— If the mind of the English people, cursed as they now are with that madness of religious dissension which has been breathed into them for the purposes of private ambition, can be alarmed by any remembrances, and warned by any events, they should never forget how nearly Ireland was lost to this country during the American war; that it was saved merely by the jealousy of the Protestant Irish towards the Catholics, then a much more insignificant and powerless body than they now are. The Catholic and the Dissenter have since combined together against you. Last war, the winds, those ancient and unsubsidised allies of England, the winds, upon which English ministers depend as much for saving kingdoms as washer-women do for drying clothes; the winds stood your friends: the French could only get into Ireland in small numbers, and the rebels were defeated. Since then, all the remaining kingdoms of Europe have been destroyed; and the Irish see that their national inde-

pendence is gone, without having received any single one of those advantages which they were taught to expect from the sacrifice. All good things were to flow from the Union; they have none of them gained anything. Every man's pride is wounded by it; no man's interest is promoted. In the seventh year of that Union, four million Catholics, lured by all kinds of promises to yield up the separate dignity and sovereignty of their country, are forced to squabble with such a man as Mr. Spencer Perceval for five thousand pounds with which to educate their children in their own mode of worship; he, the same Mr. Spencer, having secured to his own Protestant self a reversionary portion of the public money amounting to four times that sum. A senior Proctor of the University of Oxford, the head of a house, or the examining Chaplain to a Bishop, may believe these things can last: but every man of the world, whose understanding has been exercised in the business of life, must see (and see with a breaking heart) that they will soon come to a fearful termination.

Our conduct to Ireland, during the whole of this war, has been that of a man who subscribes to hospitals, weeps at charity sermons, carries out broth and blankets to beggars, and then comes home and beats his wife and children. We had compassion for the victims of all other oppression and injustice, except our own. If Switzerland was threatened, away went a Treasury Clerk with a hundred thousand pounds for Switzerland; large bags of money were kept constantly under sailing orders; upon the slightest demonstration towards Naples, down went Sir William Hamilton upon his knees, and begged for the love of St. Januarius they would help us off with a little money; all the arts of Machiavel were resorted to, to persuade Europe to borrow; troops were sent off in all directions to save the Catholic and Protestant world; the Pope himself was guarded by a regiment of English dragoons; if the Grand Lama had been at hand, he would have had another; every Catholic Clergyman who had the good fortune to be neither English nor Irish, was immediately provided with lodging, soap, crucifix, missal, chapel-beads, relics, and holy water; if Turks had landed, Turks would have received an order from the Treasury for coffee, opium, korans, and seraglios. In the midst of all this fury of saving and defending, this crusade for conscience and Christianity, there was a universal agreement among all descriptions of people to continue every species of internal persecution; to deny at home every just right that had been denied before; to pummel poor Dr. Abraham Rees and his Dissenters; and to treat the unhappy Catholics of Ireland as if their tongues were mute, their heels cloven, their nature brutal, and designedly subjected by Providence to their Orange masters.

How would my admirable brother, the Rev. Abraham Plymley, like to be marched to a Catholic chapel, to be sprinkled with the sanctified contents of a pump, to hear a number of false quantities in the Latin tongue, and to see a number of persons occupied in making right angles upon the breast and forehead? And if all this would give you so much pain, what right have you to march Catholic soldiers to a place of worship, where there is no aspersion, no rectangular gestures, and where they understand every word they hear, having first, in order to get him to enlist, made a solemn promise to the contrary? Can you wonder, after this, that the Catholic priest stops the recruiting in Ireland, as he is now doing to a most alarming degree?

The late question concerning military rank did not individually affect the lowest persons of the Catholic persuasion; but do you imagine they do not sympathise with the honour and disgrace of their superiors? Do you think that satisfaction and dissatisfaction do not travel down from Lord Fingal to the most potatoless Catholic in Ireland, and that the glory or shame of the sect is not felt by many more than these conditions personally and corporeally affect? Do you suppose that the detection of Sir H. M. and the disappointment of Mr. Perceval *in the matter*

of the Duchy of Lancaster, did not affect every dabbler in public property? Depend upon it these things were felt through all the gradations of small plunderers, down to him who filches a pound of tobacco from the King's warehouses; while, on the contrary, the acquittal of any noble and official thief would not fail to diffuse the most heartfelt satisfaction over the larcenous and burglarious world. Observe, I do not say because the lower Catholics are affected by what concerns their superiors, that they are not affected by what concerns themselves. There is no disguising the horrid truth; *there must be some relaxation with respect to tithe:* this is the cruel and heart-rending price which must be paid for national preservation. I feel how little existence will be worth having, if any alteration, however slight, is made in the property of Irish rectors; I am conscious how much such changes must affect the daily and hourly comforts of every Englishman; I shall feel too happy if they leave Europe untouched, and are not ultimately fatal to the destinies of America; but I am madly bent upon keeping foreign enemies out of the British empire, and my limited understanding presents me with no other means of effecting my object.

You talk of waiting till another reign before any alteration is made; a proposal full of good sense and good nature, if the measure in question were to pull down St. James's Palace, or to alter Kew Gardens. Will Bonaparte agree to put off his intrigues, and his invasion of Ireland? If so, I will overlook the question of justice, and finding the danger suspended, agree to the delay. I sincerely hope this reign may last many years, yet the delay of a single session of Parliament may be fatal; but if another year elapse without some serious concession made to the Catholics, I believe, before God, that all future pledges and concessions will be made in vain. I do not think that peace will do you any good under such circumstances: if Bonaparte give you a respite, it will only be to get ready the gallows on which he means to hang you. The Catholic and the Dissenter can unite in peace as well as war. If they do, the gallows is ready; and your executioner, in spite of the most solemn promises, will turn you off the next hour.

With every disposition to please (where to please within fair and rational limits is a high duty), it is impossible for public men to be long silent about the Catholics; pressing evils are not got rid of, because they are not talked of. A man may command his family to say nothing more about the stone, and surgical operations: but the ponderous malice still lies upon the nerve, and gets so big, that the patient breaks his own law of silence, clamours for the knife, and expires under its late operation. Believe me, you talk folly, when you talk of suppressing the Catholic question. I wish to God the case admitted of such a remedy: bad as it is, it does not admit of it. If the wants of the Catholics are not heard in the manly tones of Lord Grenville, or the servile drawl of Lord Castlereagh, they will be heard ere long in the madness of mobs, and the conflicts of armed men.

I observe, it is now universally the fashion to speak of the first personage in the state as the great obstacle to the measure. In the first place, I am not bound to believe such rumours because I hear them; and in the next place, I object to such language, as unconstitutional. Whoever retains his situation in the ministry, while the incapacities of the Catholics remain, is the advocate for those incapacities; and to him, and to him only, am I to look for responsibility. But waive this question of the Catholics, and put a general case:—How is a minister of this country to act when the conscientious scruples of his Sovereign prevent the execution of a measure deemed by him absolutely necessary to the safety of the country? His conduct is quite clear—he should resign. But what is his successor to do?—Resign. But is the King to be left without ministers, and is he in this manner to be compelled to act against his own conscience? Before I answer this, pray

tell me in my turn, what better defence is there against the machinations of a wicked, or the errors of a weak, Monarch, than the impossibility of finding a minister who will lend himself to vice and folly? Every English Monarch, in such a predicament, would sacrifice his opinions and views to such a clear expression of the public will; and it is one method in which the Constitution aims at bringing about such a sacrifice. You may say, if you please, the ruler of a state is forced to give up his object, when the natural love of place and power will tempt no one to assist him in its attainment. This may be force; but it is force without injury, and therefore without blame. I am not to be beat out of these obvious reasonings, and ancient constitutional provisions, by the term conscience. There is no fantasy, however wild, that a man may not persuade himself that he cherishes from motives of conscience; eternal war against impious France, or rebellious America, or Catholic Spain, may in times to come be scruples of conscience. One English Monarch may, from scruples of conscience, wish to abolish every trait of religious persecution; another Monarch may deem it his absolute and indispensable duty to make a slight provision for Dissenters out of the revenues of the Church of England. So that you see, Brother Abraham, there are cases where it would be the duty of the best and most loyal subjects to oppose the conscientious scruples of their Sovereign, still taking care that their actions were constitutional, and their modes respectful. Then you come upon me with personal questions, and say that no such dangers are to be apprehended now under our present gracious Sovereign, of whose good qualities we must be all so well convinced. All these sorts of discussions I beg leave to decline; what I have said upon constitutional topics, I mean of course for general, not for particular application. I agree with you in all the good you have said of the powers that be, and I avail myself of the opportunity of pointing out general dangers to the Constitution, at a moment when we are so completely exempted from their present influence. I cannot finish this letter without expressing my surprise and pleasure at your abuse of the servile addresses poured in upon the Throne; nor can I conceive a greater disgust to a Monarch, with a true English heart, than to see such a question as that of Catholic Emancipation argued, not with a reference to its justice or importance, but universally considered to be of no further consequence than as it affects his own private feelings. That these sentiments should be mine, is not wonderful; but how they came to be yours, does, I confess, fill me with surprise. Are you moved by the arrival of the Irish Brigade at Antwerp, and the amorous violence which awaits Mrs. Plymley?

LETTER V.

DEAR ABRAHAM,

I NEVER met a parson in my life, who did not consider the Corporation and Test Acts as the great bulwarks of the Church; and yet it is now just sixty-four years since bills of indemnity to destroy their penal effects, or, in other words, to repeal them, have been passed annually as a matter of course.

Heu vatum ignaræ mentes.

These bulwarks, without which no clergyman thinks he could sleep with his accustomed soundness, have actually not been in existence since any man now living has taken holy orders. Every year the Indemnity Act pardons past breaches of these two laws, and prevents any fresh actions of informers from coming to a conclusion before the period for the next indemnity bill arrives; so that these penalties, by which alone the Church remains in existence, have not had one moment's operation for sixty-four years. You will say the legislature, during the whole of this period, has reserved to itself the discretion of suspending, or not suspending. But had not the legislature the right of re-enacting, if it was necessary? And now when you have kept the rod over these people (with the most scan-

dalous abuse of all principle) for sixty-four years, and not found it necessary to strike once, is not that the best of all reasons why the rod should be laid aside? You talk to me of a very valuable hedge running across your fields which you would not part with on any account. I go down, expecting to find a limit impervious to cattle, and highly useful for the preservation of property; but, to my utter astonishment, I find that the hedge was cut down half a century ago, and that every year the shoots are clipped the moment they appear above ground: it appears, upon further inquiry, that the hedge never ought to have existed at all; that it originated in the malice of antiquated quarrels, and was cut down because it subjected you to vast inconvenience, and broke up your intercourse with a country absolutely necessary to your existence. If the remains of this hedge serve only to keep up an irritation in your neighbours, and to remind them of the feuds of former times, good nature and good sense teach you that you ought to grub it up, and cast it into the oven. This is the exact state of these two laws; and yet it is made a great argument against concession to the Catholics, that it involves their repeal; which is to say, Do not make me relinquish a folly that will lead to my ruin; because, if you do, I must give up other follies ten times greater than this.

I confess, with all our bulwarks and hedges, it mortifies me to the very quick, to contrast with our matchless stupidity, and inimitable folly, the conduct of Bonaparte upon the subject of religious persecution. At the moment when we are tearing the crucifixes from the necks of the Catholics, and washing pious mud from the foreheads of the Hindoos; at that moment this man is assembling the very Jews at Paris, and endeavouring to give them stability and importance. I shall never be reconciled to mending shoes in America; but I see it must be my lot, and I will then take a dreadful revenge upon Mr. Perceval, if I catch him preaching within ten miles of me. I cannot for the soul of me conceive whence this man has gained his notions of Christianity: he has the most evangelical charity for errors in arithmetic, and the most inveterate malice against errors in conscience. While he rages against those whom in the true spirit of the Gospel he ought to indulge, he forgets the only instance of severity which that Gospel contains, and leaves the jobbers, and contractors, and money-changers at their seats, without a single stripe.

You cannot imagine, you say, that England will ever be ruined and conquered; and for no other reason that I can find, but because it seems so very odd it should be ruined and conquered. Alas! so reasoned, in their time, the Austrian, Russian, and Prussian Plymleys. But the English are brave: so were all these nations. You might get together a hundred thousand men individually brave; but without generals capable of commanding such a machine, it would be as useless as a first-rate man of war manned by Oxford clergymen, or Parisian shopkeepers. I do not say this to the disparagement of English officers: they have had no means of acquiring experience; but I do say it to create alarm; for we do not appear to me to be half alarmed enough, or to entertain that sense of our danger which leads to the most obvious means of self-defence. As for the spirit of the peasantry in making a gallant defence behind hedge-rows, and through plate-racks and hen-coops, highly as I think of their bravery, I do not know any nation in Europe so likely to be struck with the panic as the English; and this from their total unacquaintance with the science of war. Old wheat and beans blazing for twenty miles round; cart mares shot; sows of Lord Somerville's breed running wild over the country; the minister of the parish wounded sorely in his hinder parts; Mrs. Plymley in fits; all these scenes of war an Austrian or a Russian has seen three or four times over; but it is now three centuries since an English pig has fallen in a fair battle upon English ground, or a farm-house been rifled, or a clergyman's wife been sub-

jected to any other proposals of love than the connubial endearments of her sleek and orthodox mate. The old edition of Plutarch's Lives, which lies in the corner of your parlour window, has contributed to work you up to the most romantic expectations of our Roman behaviour. You are persuaded that Lord Amherst will defend Kew Bridge like Cocles; that some maid of honour will break away from her captivity, and swim over the Thames; that the Duke of York will burn his capitulating hand; and little Mr. Sturges Bourne * give forty years' purchase for Moulsham Hall, while the French are encamped upon it. I hope we shall witness all this, if the French do come; but in the meantime I am so enchanted with the ordinary English behaviour of these invaluable persons, that I earnestly pray no opportunity may be given them for Roman valour, and for those very un-Roman pensions which they would all, of course, take especial care to claim in consequence. But whatever was our conduct, if every ploughman was as great a hero as he who was called from his oxen to save Rome from her enemies, I should still say, that at such a crisis you want the affections of all your subjects, in both islands: there is no spirit which you must alienate, no heart you must avert, every man must feel he has a country, and that there is an urgent and pressing cause why he should expose himself to death.

The effects of penal laws, in matters of religion, are never confined to those limits in which the legislature intended they should be placed: it is not only that I am excluded from certain offices and dignities because I am a Catholic, but the exclusion carries with it a certain stigma, which degrades me in the eyes of the monopolising sect, and the very name of my religion becomes odious. These effects are so very striking in England, that I solemnly believe blue and red baboons to be more popular here than Catholics and Presbyterians; they are more understood, and there is a greater disposition to do something for them. When a country squire hears of an ape, his first feeling is to give it nuts and apples; when he hears of a Dissenter, his immediate impulse is to commit it to the county jail, to shave its head, to alter its customary food, and to have it privately whipped. This is no caricature, but an accurate picture of national feelings, as they degrade and endanger us at this very moment. The Irish Catholic gentleman would bear his legal disabilities with greater temper, if these were all he had to bear — if they did not enable every Protestant cheesemonger and tide-waiter to treat him with contempt. He is branded on the forehead with a red-hot iron, and treated like a spiritual felon, because, in the highest of all considerations he is led by the noblest of all guides, his own disinterested conscience.

Why are nonsense and cruelty a bit the better because they are enacted? If Providence, which gives wine and oil, had blessed us with that tolerant spirit which makes the countenance more pleasant and the heart more glad than these can do; if our Statute book had never been defiled with such infamous laws, the sepulchral Spencer Perceval would have been hauled through the dirtiest horse-pond in Hampstead, had he ventured to propose them. But now persecution is good, because it exists; every law which originated in ignorance and malice, and gratifies the passions from whence it sprang, we call the wisdom of our ancestors: when such laws are repealed, they will be cruelty and madness; till they are repealed, they are policy and caution.

I was somewhat amused with the imputation brought against the Catholics by the University of Oxford, that they are enemies to liberty. I immediately turned to my History of England, and marked as an historical error that passage in which it is recorded that, in the reign of Queen Anne, the famous decree of the University of Oxford, respecting passive obedience, was

* There is nothing more objectionable in Plymley's Letters than the abuse of Mr. Sturges Bourne, who is an honourable, able, and excellent person; but such are the malevolent effects of party spirit.

ordered, by the House of Lords, to be burnt by the hands of the common hangman, as contrary to the liberty of the subject, and the law of the land. Nevertheless, I wish, whatever be the modesty of those who impute, that the imputation was a little more true, the Catholic cause would not be quite so desperate with the present Administration. I fear, however, that the hatred to liberty in these poor devoted wretches may ere long appear more doubtful than it is at present to the Vice-Chancellor and his Clergy, inflamed, as they doubtless are, with classical examples of republican virtue, and panting, as they always have been, to reduce the power of the Crown within narrower and safer limits. What mistaken zeal, to attempt to connect one religion with freedom and another with slavery! Who laid the foundations of English liberty? What was the mixed religion of Switzerland? What has the Protestant religion done for liberty in Denmark, in Sweden, throughout the North of Germany, and in Prussia? The purest religion in the world, in my humble opinion, is the religion of the Church of England: for its preservation (so far as it is exercised without intruding upon the liberties of others) I am ready at this moment to venture my present life, and but through that religion I have no hopes of any other; yet I am not forced to be silly because I am pious; nor will I ever join in eulogiums on my faith, which every man of common reading and common sense can so easily refute.

You have either done too much for the Catholics (worthy Abraham), or too little; if you had intended to refuse them political power, you should have refused them civil rights. After you had enabled them to acquire property, after you had conceded to them all that you did concede in '78 and '93, the rest is wholly out of your power: you may choose whether you will give the rest in an honourable or a disgraceful mode, but it is utterly out of your power to withhold it.

In the last year, land to the amount of *eight hundred thousand pounds* was purchased by the Catholics in Ireland. Do you think it possible to be-Perceval, and be Canning, and be-Castlereagh, such a body of men as this out of their common rights, and their common sense? Mr. George Canning may laugh and joke at the idea of Protestant bailiffs ravishing Catholic ladies, under the 9th clause of the Sunset Bill; but if some better remedy be not applied to the distractions of Ireland than the jocularity of Mr. Canning, they will soon put an end to his pension, and to the pension of those "near and dear relatives," for whose eating, drinking, washing, and clothing, every man in the United Kingdoms now pays his two-pence or three-pence a year. You may call these observations coarse, if you please; but I have no idea that the Sophias and Carolines of any man breathing are to eat national veal, to drink public tea, to wear Treasury ribands, and then that we are to be told that it is coarse to animadvert upon this pitiful and eleemosynary splendour. If this is right, why not mention it? If it is wrong, why should not he who enjoys the ease of supporting his sisters in this manner bear the shame of it? Everybody seems hitherto to have spared a man who never spares anybody.

As for the enormous wax candles, and superstitious mummeries, and painted jackets of the Catholic priests, I fear them not. Tell me that the world will return again under the influence of the smallpox; that Lord Castlereagh will hereafter oppose the power of the Court; that Lord Howick and Mr. Grattan will do each of them a mean and dishonourable action; that anybody who has heard Lord Redesdale speak once will knowingly and willingly hear him again; that Lord Eldon has assented to the fact of two and two making four, without shedding tears, or expressing the smallest doubt or scruple; tell me any other thing absurd or incredible, but, for the love of common sense, let me hear no more of the danger to be apprehended from the general diffusion of Popery. It is too absurd to be reasoned upon; every man feels it is nonsense when he hears

it stated, and so does every man while he is stating it.

I cannot imagine why the friends to the Church Establishment should entertain such a horror of seeing the doors of Parliament flung open to the Catholics, and view so passively the enjoyment of that right by the Presbyterians and by every other species of Dissenter. In their tenets, in their Church government, in the nature of their endowments, the Dissenters are infinitely more distant from the Church of England than the Catholics are; yet the Dissenters have never been excluded from Parliament. There are 45 members in one House, and 16 in the other, who always are Dissenters. There is no law which would prevent every member of the Lords and Commons from being Dissenters. The Catholics could not bring into Parliament half the number of the Scotch members; and yet one exclusion is of such immense importance, because it has taken place; and the other no human being thinks of, because no one is accustomed to it. I have often thought, if the *wisdom of our ancestors* had excluded all persons with red hair from the House of Commons, of the throes and convulsions it would occasion to restore them to their natural rights. What mobs and riots would it produce! To what infinite abuse and obloquy would the capillary patriot be exposed; what wormwood would distil from Mr. Perceval, what froth would drop from Mr. Canning; how (I will not say *my*, but *our* Lord Hawkesbury, for he belongs to us all)—how our Lord Hawkesbury would work away about the hair of King William and Lord Somers, and the authors of the great and glorious Revolution; how Lord Eldon would appeal to the Deity and his own virtues, and to the hair of his children: some would say that red-haired men were superstitious; some would prove they were atheists; they would be petitioned against as the friends of slavery, and the advocates for revolt; in short, such a corruptor of the heart and the understanding is the spirit of persecution, that these unfortunate people (conspired against by their fellow-subjects of every complexion), if they did not emigrate to countries where hair of another colour was persecuted, would be driven to the falsehood of perukes, or the hypocrisy of the Tricosian fluid.

As for the dangers of the Church (in spite of the staggering events which have lately taken place), I have not yet entirely lost my confidence in the power of common sense, and I believe the Church to be in no danger at all; but if it is, that danger is not from the Catholics, but from the Methodists, and from that patent Christianity which has been for some time manufacturing at Clapham, to the prejudice of the old and admirable article prepared by the Church. I would counsel my lords the Bishops to keep their eyes upon that holy village, and its hallowed vicinity: they will find there a zeal in making converts far superior to anything which exists among the Catholics; a contempt for the great mass of English clergy, much more rooted and profound; and a regular fund to purchase livings for those groaning and garrulous gentlemen, whom they denominate (by a standing sarcasm against the regular Church) Gospel preachers, and vital clergymen. I am too firm a believer in the general propriety and respectability of the English clergy, to believe they have much to fear either from old nonsense, or from new; but if the Church must be supposed to be in danger, I prefer that nonsense which is grown half venerable from time, the force of which I have already tried and baffled, which at least has some excuse in the dark and ignorant ages in which it originated. The religious enthusiasm manufactured by living men before my own eyes disgusts my understanding as much, influences my imagination not at all, and excites my apprehensions much more.

I may have seemed to you to treat the situation of public affairs with some degree of levity; but I feel it deeply, and with nightly and daily anguish; because I know Ireland; I have known it all my life; I love it, and I foresee the crisis to which it will soon be exposed. Who can doubt but that Ireland will experience ultimately from

France a treatment to which the conduct they have experienced from England is the love of a parent, or a brother? Who can doubt but that five years after he has got hold of the country, Ireland will be tossed away by Bonaparte as a present to some one of his ruffian generals, who will knock the head of Mr. Keogh against the head of Cardinal Troy, shoot twenty of the most noisy blockheads of the Roman persuasion, wash his pug-dogs in holy water, and confiscate the salt butter of the Milesian Republic to the last tub? But what matters this? or who is wise enough in Ireland to heed it? or when had common sense much influence with my poor dear Irish? Mr. Perceval does not know the Irish; but I know them, and I know that at every rash and mad hazard, they will break the Union, revenge their wounded pride and their insulted religion, and fling themselves into the open arms of France, sure of dying in the embrace. And now what means have you of guarding against this coming evil, upon which the future happiness or misery of every Englishman depends? Have you a single ally in the whole world? Is there a vulnerable point in the French empire where the astonishing resources of that people can be attracted and employed? Have you a ministry wise enough to comprehend the danger, manly enough to believe unpleasant intelligence, honest enough to state their apprehensions at the peril of their places? Is there anywhere the slightest disposition to join any measure of love, or conciliation, or hope, with that dreadful bill which the distractions of Ireland have rendered necessary? At the very moment that the last Monarchy in Europe has fallen, are we not governed by a man of pleasantry, and a man of theology? In the six hundredth year of our empire over Ireland, have we any memorial of ancient kindness to refer to? any people, any zeal, any country on which we can depend? Have we any hope, but in the winds of heaven, and the tides of the sea? any prayer to prefer to the Irish, but that they should forget and forgive their oppressors, who, in the very moment that they are calling upon them for their exertions, solemnly assure them that the oppression shall still remain.

Abraham, farewell! If I have tired you, remember how often you have tired me and others. I do not think we really differ in politics so much as you suppose; or, at least, if we do, that difference is in the means, and not in the end. We both love the Constitution, respect the King, and abhor the French. But though you love the Constitution, you would perpetuate the abuses which have been engrafted upon it; though you respect the King, you would confirm his scruples against the Catholics; though you abhor the French, you would open to them the conquest of Ireland. My method of respecting my Sovereign is by protecting his honour, his empire, and his lasting happiness; I evince my love of the Constitution, by making it the guardian of all men's rights and the source of their freedom; and I prove my abhorrence of the French, by uniting against them the disciples of every church in the only remaining nation in Europe. As for the men of whom I have been compelled in this age of mediocrity to say so much, they cannot of themselves be worth a moment's consideration, to you, to me, or to anybody. In a year after their death, they will be forgotten as completely as if they had never been; and are now of no further importance, than as they are the mere vehicles of carrying into effect the common-place and mischievous prejudices of the times in which they live.

LETTER VI.

DEAR ABRAHAM,

WHAT amuses me the most is to hear of the *indulgences* which the Catholics have received, and their exorbitance in not being satisfied with those indulgences: now if you complain to me that a man is obtrusive and shameless in his requests, and that it is impossible to bring him to reason, I must first of all hear the whole of your conduct

towards him; for you may have taken from him so much in the first instance, that, in spite of a long series of restitution, a vast latitude for petition may still remain behind.

There is a village (no matter where) in which the inhabitants, on one day in the year, sit down to a dinner prepared at the common expense; by an extraordinary piece of tyranny (which Lord Hawkesbury would call the wisdom of the village ancestors), the inhabitants of three of the streets, about a hundred years ago, seized upon the inhabitants of the fourth street, bound them hand and foot, laid them upon their backs, and compelled them to look on while the rest were stuffing themselves with beef and beer: the next year the inhabitants of the persecuted street (though they contributed an equal quota of the expense) were treated precisely in the same manner. The tyranny grew into a custom; and (as the manner of our nature is) it was considered as the most sacred of all duties to keep these poor fellows without their annual dinner: the village was so tenacious of this practice, that nothing could induce them to resign it; every enemy to it was looked upon as a disbeliever in Divine Providence, and any nefarious churchwarden who wished to succeed in his election had nothing to do but to represent his antagonist as an abolitionist, in order to frustrate his ambition, endanger his life, and throw the village into a state of the most dreadful commotion. By degrees, however, the obnoxious street grew to be so well peopled, and its inhabitants so firmly united, that their oppressors, more afraid of injustice, were more disposed to be just. At the next dinner they are unbound, the year after allowed to sit upright, then a bit of bread and a glass of water; till at last, after a long series of concessions, they are emboldened to ask, in pretty plain terms, that they may be allowed to sit down at the bottom of the table, and to fill their bellies as well as the rest. Forthwith a general cry of shame and scandal: "Ten years ago, were you not laid upon your backs? Don't you remember what a great thing you thought it to get a piece of bread? How thankful you were for cheese-parings? Have you forgotten that memorable era when the lord of the manor interfered to obtain for you a slice of the public pudding? And now, with an audacity only equalled by your ingratitude, you have the impudence to ask for knives and forks, and to request, in terms too plain to be mistaken, that you may sit down to table with the rest, and be indulged even with beef and beer: there are not more than half a dozen dishes which we have reserved for ourselves; the rest has been thrown open to you in the utmost profusion; you have potatoes, and carrots, suet dumplings, sops in the pan, and delicious toast and water, in incredible quantities. Beef, mutton, lamb, pork, and veal are ours; and if you were not the most restless and dissatisfied of human beings, you would never think of aspiring to enjoy them."

Is not this, my dainty Abraham, the very nonsense and the very insult which is talked to and practised upon the Catholics? You are surprised that men who have tasted of partial justice should ask for perfect justice; that he who has been robbed of coat and cloak will not be contented with the restitution of one of his garments. He would be a very lazy blockhead if he were content, and I (who, though an inhabitant of the village, have preserved, thank God, some sense of justice), most earnestly counsel these half-fed claimants to persevere in their just demands, till they are admitted to a more complete share of a dinner for which they pay as much as the others; and if they see a little attenuated lawyer squabbling at the head of their opponents, let them desire him to empty his pockets, and to pull out all the pieces of duck, fowl, and pudding, which he has filched from the public feast, to carry home to his wife and children.

You parade a great deal upon the vast concessions made by this country to the Irish before the Union. I deny that any voluntary concession was ever made by England to Ireland. What

did Ireland ever ask that was granted? What did she ever demand that was not refused? How did she get her Mutiny Bill—a limited parliament—a repeal of Poyning's Law—a constitution? Not by the concessions of England, but by her fears. When Ireland asked for all these things upon her knees, her petitions were rejected with Perceval ism and contempt; when she demanded them with the voice of 60,000 armed men, they were granted with every mark of consternation and dismay. Ask of Lord Auckland the fatal consequences of trifling with such a people as the Irish. He himself was the organ of these refusals. As secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant, the insolence and the tyranny of this country passed through his hands. Ask him if he remembers the consequences. Ask him if he has forgotten that memorable evening, when he came down booted and mantled to the House of Commons, when he told the House he was about to set off for Ireland that night, and declared before God, if he did not carry with him a compliance with all their demands, Ireland was for ever lost to this country. The present generation have forgotten this; but I have not forgotten it; and I know, hasty and undignified as the submission of England then was, that Lord Auckland was right, that the delay of a single day might very probably have separated the two people for ever. The terms submission and fear are galling terms, when applied from the lesser nation to the greater; but it is the plain historical truth, it is the natural consequence of injustice, it is the predicament in which every country places itself which leaves such a mass of hatred and discontent by its side. No empire is powerful enough to endure it; it would exhaust the strength of China, and sink it with all its mandarins and tea-kettles to the bottom of the deep. By refusing them justice, now when you are strong enough to refuse them anything more than justice, you will act over again, with the Catholics, the same scene of mean and precipitate submission which disgraced you before America, and before the volunteers of Ireland. We shall live to hear the Hampstead Protestant pronouncing such extravagant panegyrics upon holy water, and paying such fulsome compliments to the thumbs and offals of departed saints, that parties will change sentiments, and Lord Henry Petty and Sam Whitbread take a spell at No Popery. The wisdom of Mr. Fox was alike employed in teaching his country justice when Ireland was weak, and dignity when Ireland was strong. We are fast pacing round the same miserable circle of ruin and imbecility. Alas! where is our guide?

You say that Ireland is a millstone about our necks; that it would be better for us if Ireland were sunk at the bottom of the sea; that the Irish are a nation of irreclaimable savages and barbarians. How often have I heard these sentiments fall from the plump and thoughtless squire, and from the thriving English shopkeeper, who has never felt the rod of an Orange master upon his back. Ireland a millstone about your neck! Why is it not a stone of Ajax in your hand? I agree with you most cordially, that, governed as Ireland now is, it would be a vast accession of strength if the waves of the sea were to rise and engulf her to-morrow. At this moment, opposed as we are to all the world, the annihilation of one of the most fertile islands on the face of the globe, containing five millions of human creatures, would be one of the most solid advantages which could happen to this country. I doubt very much, in spite of all the just abuse which has been lavished upon Bonaparte, whether there is any one of his conquered countries the blotting out of which would be as beneficial to him as the destruction of Ireland would be to us: of countries I speak differing in language from the French, little habituated to their intercourse, and inflamed with all the resentments of a recently conquered people. Why will you attribute the turbulence of our people to any cause but the right—to any cause but your own scandalous oppression? If you tie your horse up to a gate, and beat him cruelly, is he vicious

beeause he kicks you? If you have plagued and worried a mastiff dog for years, is he mad because he flies at you whenever he sees you? Hatred is an active, troublesome passion. Depend upon it, whole nations have always some reason for their hatred. Before you refer the turbulence of the Irish to incurable defects in their character, tell me if you have treated them as friends and equals? Have you protected their commerce? Have you respected their religion? Have you been as anxious for their freedom as your own? Nothing of all this. What then? Why you have confiscated the territorial surface of the country twice over: you have massacred and exported her inhabitants: you have deprived four fifths of them of every civil privilege: you have at every period made her commerce and manufactures slavishly subordinate to your own: and yet the hatred which the Irish bear to you is the result of an original turbulence of character, and of a primitive, obdurate wildness, utterly incapable of civilisation. The embroidered inanities and the sixth-form effusions of Mr. Canning are really not powerful enough to make me believe this; nor is there any authority on earth (always excepting the Dean of Christ Church) which could make it credible to me. I am sick of Mr. Canning. There is not a "ha'p'orth of bread to all this sugar and sack." I love not the cretaceous and incredible countenance of his colleague. The only opinion in which I agree with these two gentlemen is that which they entertain of each other; I am sure that the insolence of Mr. Pitt, and the unbalanced accounts of Melville, were far better than the perils of this new ignorance:—

Nonne fuit satius tristes Amaryllidis iras
Atque superba pati fastidia — nonne Menalcam
Quamvis ille *niger?*

In the midst of the most profound peace, the secret articles of the Treaty of Tilsit, in which the destruction of Ireland is resolved upon, induce you to rob the Danes of their fleet. After the expedition sailed comes the Treaty of Tilsit, containing no article*, public or private, alluding to Ireland. The state of the world, you tell me, justified us in doing this. Just God! do we think only of the state of the world when there is an opportunity for robbery, for murder, and for plunder; and do we forget the state of the world when we are called upon to be wise, and good, and just? Does the state of the world never remind us, that we have four millions of subjects whose injuries we ought to atone for, and whose affections we ought to conciliate? Does the state of the world never warn us to lay aside our infernal bigotry, and to arm every man who acknowledges a God and can grasp a sword? Did it never occur to this administration that they might virtuously get hold of a force ten times greater than the force of the Danish fleet? Was there no other way of protecting Ireland, but by bringing eternal shame upon Great Britain, and by making the earth a den of robbers? See what the men whom you have supplanted would have done. They would have rendered the invasion of Ireland impossible, by restoring to the Catholics their long-lost rights: they would have acted in such a manner that the French would neither have wished for invasion, nor dared to attempt it: they would have increased the permanent strength of the country while they preserved its reputation unsullied. Nothing of this kind your friends have done, because they are solemnly pledged to do nothing of this kind; because to tolerate all religions, and to equalise civil rights to all sects, is to oppose some of the worst passions of our nature — to plunder and to oppress is to gratify them all. They wanted the huzzas of mobs, and they have for ever blasted the fame of England to obtain them Were the fleets of Holland, France, and Spain destroyed by larceny? You resisted the power of 150 sail of the line by sheer courage, and violated every principle of morals from the dread of

* This is now completely confessed to be the case by ministers.

15 hulks, while the expedition itself cost you three times more than the value of the larcenous matter brought away. The French trample upon the laws of God and man, not for old cordage, but for kingdoms, and always take care to be well paid for their crimes. We contrive, under the present administration, to unite moral with intellectual deficiency, and to grow weaker and worse by the same action. If they had any evidence of the intended hostility of the Danes, why was it not produced? Why have the nations of Europe been allowed to feel an indignation against this country beyond the reach of all subsequent information? Are these times, do you imagine, when we can trifle with a year of universal hatred, dally with the curses of Europe, and then regain a lost character at pleasure, by the parliamentary perspirations of the Foreign Secretary, or the solemn asseverations of the pecuniary Rose? Believe me, Abraham, it is not under such ministers as these that the dexterity of honest Englishmen will ever equal the dexterity of French knaves; it is not in their presence that the serpent of Moses will ever swallow up the serpents of the magician.

Lord Hawkesbury says that nothing is to be granted to the Catholics from fear. What! not even justice? Why not? There are four millions of disaffected people within twenty miles of your own coast. I fairly confess, that the dread which I have of their physical power, is with me a very strong motive for listening to their claims. To talk of not acting from fear is mere parliamentary cant. From what motive but fear, I should be glad to know, have all the improvements in our constitution proceeded? I question if any justice has ever been done to large masses of mankind from any other motive. By what other motives can the plunderers of the Baltic suppose nations to be governed in their intercourse *with each other?* If I say, give this people what they ask because it is just, do you think I should get ten people to listen to me? Would not the lesser of the two Jenkinsons be the first to treat me with contempt? the only true way to make the mass of mankind see the beauty of justice, is by showing to them in pretty plain terms the consequences of injustice. If any body of French troops land in Ireland, the whole population of that country will rise against you to a man, and you could not possibly survive such an event three years. Such from the bottom of my soul, do I believe to be the present state of that country; and so far does it appear to me to be impolitic and unstatesmanlike to concede anything to such a danger, that if the Catholics, in addition to their present just demands, were to petition for the perpetual removal of the said Lord Hawkesbury from his Majesty's councils, I think, whatever might be the effect upon the destinies of Europe, and however it might retard our own individual destruction, that the prayer of the petition should be instantly complied with. Canning's crocodile tears should not move me; the hoops of the maids of honour should not hide him. I would tear him from the banisters of the back stairs, and plunge him in the fishy fumes of the dirtiest of all his Cinque Ports.

LETTER VII.

Dear Abraham,

In the correspondence which is passing between us you are perpetually alluding to the Foreign Secretary; and in answer to the dangers of Ireland, which I am pressing upon your notice, you have nothing to urge but the confidence which you repose in the discretion and sound sense of this gentleman.* I can only say, that I have listened to him long and often,

* The attack upon virtue and morals in the debate upon Copenhagen is brought forward with great ostentation by this gentleman's friends. But is Harlequin less Harlequin because he acts well? I was present: he leaped about, touched facts with his wand, turned yes into no, and no into yes: it was a pantomime well played, but a pantomime: Harlequin deserves higher wages than he did two years ago: is he therefore fit for serious parts?

with the greatest attention ; I have used every exertion in my power to take a fair measure of him, and it appears to me impossible to hear him upon any arduous topic without perceiving that he is eminently deficient in those solid and serious qualities upon which, and upon which alone, the confidence of a great country can properly repose. He sweats, and labours, and works for sense, and Mr. Ellis seems always to think it is coming, but it does not come ; the machine can't draw up what is not to be found in the spring ; Providence has made him a light, jesting, paragraph-writing man, and that he will remain to his dying day. When he is jocular he is strong, when he is serious he is like Samson in a wig : any ordinary person is a match for him : a song, an ironical letter, a burlesque ode, an attack in the Newspaper upon Nicoll's eye, a smart speech of twenty minutes, full of gross misrepresentations and clever turns, excellent language, a spirited manner, lucky quotation, success in provoking dull men, some half information picked up in Pall Mall in the morning : these are your friend's natural weapons ; all these things he can do ; here I allow him to be truly great : nay, I will be just, and go still further, if he would confine himself to these things, and consider the *facete* and the playful to be the basis of his character, he would for that species of man, be universally regarded as a person of a very good understanding ; call him a legislator, a reasoner, and the conductor of the affairs of a great nation, and it seems to me as absurd as if a butterfly were to teach bees to make honey. That he is an extraordinary writer of small poetry, and a diner out of the highest lustre, I do most readily admit. After George Selwyn, and perhaps Tickell, there has been no such man for this half century. The Foreign Secretary is a gentleman, a respectable as well as a highly agreeable man in private life ; but you may as well feed me with decayed potatoes as console me for the miseries of Ireland by the resources of his *sense* and his *discretion*. It is only the public situation which this gentleman holds which entitles me or induces me to say so much about him. He is a fly in amber, nobody cares about the fly: the only question is, How the Devil did it get there ? Nor do I attack him for the love of glory, but from the love of utility, as a burgomaster hunts a rat in a Dutch dyke, for fear it should flood a province.

The friends of the Catholic question are, I observe, extremely embarrassed in arguing when they come to the loyalty of the Irish Catholics. As for me, I shall go straight forward to my object, and state what I have no manner of doubt, from an intimate knowledge of Ireland, to be the plain truth. Of the great Roman Catholic proprietors, and of the Catholic prelates, there may be a few, and but a few, who would follow the fortunes of England at all events : there is another set of men who, thoroughly detesting this country, have too much property and too much character to lose, not to wait for some very favourable event before they show themselves ; but the great mass of Catholic population, upon the slightest appearance of a French force in that country, would rise upon you to a man. It is the most mistaken policy to conceal the plain truth. There is no loyalty among the Catholics : they detest you as their worst oppressors, and they will continue to detest you till you remove the cause of their hatred. It is in your power in six months' time to produce a total revolution of opinions among this people ; and in some future letter I will show you that this is clearly the case. At present, see what a dreadful state Ireland is in. The common toast among the low Irish is, the feast of the *passover*. Some allusion to *Bonaparte*, in a play lately acted at Dublin, produced thunders of applause from the pit and the galleries ; and a politician should not be inattentive to the public feelings expressed in theatres. Mr. Perceval thinks he has disarmed the Irish : he has no more disarmed the Irish than he has resigned a shilling

of his own public emoluments. An Irish * peasant fills the barrel of his gun full of tow dipped in oil, butters up the lock, buries it in a bog, and allows the Orange bloodhound to ransack his cottage at pleasure. Be just and kind to the Irish, and you will indeed disarm them ; rescue them from the degraded servitude in which they are held by a handful of their own countrymen, and you will add four millions of brave and affectionate men to your strength. Nightly visits, Protestant inspectors, licences to possess a pistol, or a knife and fork, the odious vigour of the *evangelical* Perceval — acts of Parliament, drawn up by some English attorney, to save you from the hatred of four millions of people — the guarding yourselves from universal disaffection by a police; a confidence in the little cunning of Bow Street, when you might rest your security upon the eternal basis of the best feelings : this is the meanness and madness to which nations are reduced when they lose sight of the first elements of justice, without which a country can be no more secure than it can be healthy without air. I sicken at such policy and such men. The fact is, the Ministers know nothing about the present state of Ireland ; Mr. Perceval sees a few clergymen, Lord Castlereagh a few general officers, who take care, of course, to report what is pleasant rather than what is true. As for the joyous and lepid consul, he jokes upon neutral flags and frauds, jokes upon Irish rebels, jokes upon northern, and western, and southern foes, and gives himself no trouble upon any subject: nor is the mediocrity of the idolatrous deputy of the slightest use. Dissolved in grins, he reads no memorials upon the state of Ireland, listens to no reports, asks no questions, and is the

"*Bourn* from whom no traveller returns."

* No man who is not intimately acquainted with the Irish, can tell to what a curious extent this concealment of arms is carried. I have stated the exact mode in which it is done.

The danger of an immediate insurrection is now, I *believe**, blown over. You have so strong an army in Ireland, and the Irish are become so much more cunning from the last insurrection, that you may perhaps be tolerably secure just at present from that evil : but are you secure from the efforts which the French may make to throw a body of troops into Ireland ? and do you consider that event to be difficult and improbable ? From Brest Harbour to Cape St. Vincent, you have above three thousand miles of hostile sea coast, and twelve or fourteen harbours quite capable of containing a sufficient force for the powerful invasion of Ireland. The nearest of these harbours is not two days' sail from the southern coast of Ireland, with a fair leading wind ; and the furthest not ten. Five ships of the line, for so very short a passage, might carry five or six thousand troops with cannon and ammunition ; and Ireland presents to their attack a southern coast of more than 500 miles, abounding in deep bays, admirable harbours, and disaffected inhabitants. Your blockading ships may be forced to come home for provisions and repairs, or they may be blown off in a gale of wind and compelled to bear away for their own coast ; — and you will observe, that the very same wind which locks you up in the British Channel when you are got there, is evidently favourable for the invasion of Ireland. And yet this is called Government, and the people huzza Mr. Perceval for continuing to expose his country day after day to such tremendous perils as these ; cursing the men who would have given up a question in theology to have saved us from such a risk. The British empire at this moment is in the state of a peach-blossom — if the wind blows gently from one quarter, it survives, if furiously from the other, it perishes. A stiff breeze may set in from the north, the Rochefort squadron will be taken, and the

* I know too much, however, of the state of Ireland, not to speak tremblingly about this. I hope to God I am right.

Minister will be the most holy of men : if it comes from some other point, Ireland is gone ; we curse ourselves as a set of monastic madmen, and call out for the unavailing satisfaction of Mr. Perceval's head. Such a state of political existence is scarcely credible ; it is the action of a mad young fool standing upon one foot, and peeping down the crater of Mount Ætna, not the conduct of a wise and sober people deciding upon their best and dearest interests : and in the name, the much-injured name, of Heaven, what is it all for that we expose ourselves to these dangers ? Is it that we may sell more muslin ? Is it that we may acquire more territory? Is it that we may strengthen what we have already acquired ? No : nothing of all this ; but that one set of Irishmen may torture another set of Irishmen — that Sir Phelim O'Callaghan may continue to whip Sir Toby M'Tackle, his next door neighbour, and continue to ravish his Catholic daughters ; and these are the measures which the honest and consistent Secretary supports ; and this is the Secretary, whose genius in the estimation of Brother Abraham is to extinguish the genius of Bonaparte. Pompey was killed by a slave, Goliah smitten by a stripling, Pyrrhus died by the hand of a woman ; tremble, thou great Gaul, from whose head an armed Minerva leaps forth in the hour of danger ; tremble, thou scourge of God, a pleasant man is come out against thee, and thou shalt be laid low by a joker of jokes, and he shall talk his pleasant talk against thee, and thou shalt be no more !

You tell me, in spite of all this parade of sea coast, Bonaparte has neither ships nor sailors ; but this is a mistake. He has not ships and sailors to contest the empire of the seas with Great Britain, but there remains quite sufficient of the navies of France, Spain, Holland, and Denmark, for these short excursions and invasions. Do you think, too, that Bonaparte does not add to his navy every year ? Do you suppose, with all Europe at his feet, that he can find any difficulty in obtaining timber, and that money will not procure for him any quantity of naval stores he may want ? The mere machine, the empty ship, he can build as well, and as quickly, as you can ; and though he may not find enough of practised sailors to man large fighting fleets — it is not possible to conceive that he can want sailors for such sort of purposes as I have stated. He is at present the despotic monarch of above twenty thousand miles of sea coast, and yet you suppose he cannot procure sailors for the invasion of Ireland. Believe, if you please, that such a fleet met at sea by any number of our ships at all comparable to them in point of force, would be immediately taken, let it be so; I count nothing upon their power of resistance, only upon their power of escaping unobserved. If experience has taught us anything, it is the impossibility of perpetual blockades. The instances are innumerable, during the course of this war, where whole fleets have sailed in and out of harbour in spite of every vigilance used to prevent it. I shall only mention those cases where Ireland is concerned. In December, 1796, seven ships of the line, and ten transports, reached Bantry Bay from Brest, without having seen an English ship in their passage. It blew a storm when they were off shore, and therefore England still continues to be an independent kingdom. You will observe that at the very time the French fleet sailed out of Brest Harbour, Admiral Colpoys was cruising off there with a powerful squadron, and still, from the particular circumstances of the weather, found it impossible to prevent the French from coming out. During the time that Admiral Colpoys was cruising off Brest, Admiral Richery, with six ships of the line, passed him, and got safe into the harbour. At the very moment when the French squadron was lying in Bantry Bay, Lord Bridport with his fleet was locked up by a foul wind in the Channel, and for several days could not stir to the assistance of Ireland. Admiral Colpoys, totally unable to find the French fleet,

came home. Lord Bridport, at the change of the wind, cruised for them in vain, and they got safe back to Brest, without having seen a single one of those floating bulwarks, the possession of which we believe will enable us with impunity to set justice and common sense at defiance. Such is the miserable and precarious state of an anemocracy, of a people who put their trust in hurricanes, and are governed by wind. In August, 1798, three forty-gun frigates landed 1100 men under Humbert, making the passage from Rochelle to Killala without seeing any English ship. In October of the same year, four French frigates anchored in Killala Bay with 2000 troops; and though they did not land their troops, they returned to France in safety. In the same month, a line-of-battle ship, eight stout frigates, and a brig, all full of troops and stores, reached the coast of Ireland, and were fortunately, in sight of land, destroyed, after an obstinate engagement, by Sir John Warren.

If you despise the little troop which, in these numerous experiments, did make good its landing, take with you, if you please, this *précis* of its exploits: eleven hundred men, commanded by a soldier raised from the ranks, put to rout a select army of 6000 men, commanded by General Lake, seized their ordnance, ammunition, and stores, advanced 150 miles into a country containing an armed force of 150,000 men, and at last surrendered to the Viceroy, an experienced general, gravely and cautiously advancing, at the head of all his chivalry and of an immense army, to oppose him. You must excuse these details about Ireland; but it appears to me to be of all other subjects the most important. If we conciliate Ireland, we can do nothing amiss; if we do not, we can do nothing well. If Ireland was friendly, we might equally set at defiance the talents of Bonaparte, and the blunders of his rival, Mr. Canning; we could then support the ruinous and silly bustle of our useless expeditions, and the almost incredible ignorance of our commercial Orders in Council. Let the present administration give up but this one point, and there is nothing which I would not consent to grant them. Mr. Perceval shall have full liberty to insult the tomb of Mr. Fox, and to torment every eminent Dissenter in Great Britain; Lord Camden shall have large boxes of plums; Mr. Rose receive permission to prefix to his name the appellative of virtuous; and to the Viscount Castlereagh * a round sum of ready money shall be well and truly paid into his hand. Lastly, what remains to Mr. George Canning, but that he ride up and down Pall Mall glorious upon a white horse, and that they cry out before him, Thus shall it be done to the statesman who hath written "The Needy Knife-Grinder," and the German play? Adieu only for the present; you shall soon hear from me again; it is a subject upon which I cannot long be silent.

LETTER VIII.

Nothing can be more erroneous than to suppose that Ireland is not bigger than the Isle of Wight, or of more consequence than Guernsey or Jersey; and yet I am almost inclined to believe, from the general supineness which prevails here respecting the dangerous state of that country, that such is the rank which it holds in our statistical tables. I have been writing to you a great deal about Ireland, and perhaps it may be of some use to state to you concisely the nature and resources of the country which has been the subject of our long and strange correspondence. There were returned, as I have before observed, to the hearth tax, in 1791, 701,132 † houses, which Mr. Newenham shows, from unquestionable documents, to be nearly 80,000 below the real number of

* This is a very unjust imputation on Lord Castlereagh.

† The checks to population were very trifling from the rebellion. It lasted two months: of his Majesty's Irish forces there perished about 1600: of the rebels 11,000 were killed in the field, and 2000 hanged or exported: 400 loyal persons were assassinated

houses in that country. There are 27,457 square English miles in Ireland *, and more than five millions of people.

By the last survey it appears that the inhabited houses in England and Wales amount to 1,574,902; and the population to 9,343,578, which gives an average of $5\frac{7}{8}$ to each house, in a country where the density of population is certainly less considerable than in Ireland. It is commonly supposed that two-fifths of the army and navy are Irishmen, at periods when political disaffection does not avert the Catholics from the service. The current value of Irish exports in 1807 was 9,314,854*l.* 17*s.* 7*d.*; a state of commerce about equal to the commerce of England in the middle of the reign of George II. The tonnage of ships entered inward and cleared outward in the trade of Ireland, in 1807, amounted to 1,567,430 tons. The quantity of home spirits exported amounted to 10,284 gallons in 1796, and to 930,800 gallons in 1804. Of the exports which I have stated, provisions amounted to four millions, and linen to about four millions and a half. There was exported from Ireland, upon an average of two years ending in January, 1804, 591,274 barrels of barley, oats, and wheat; and by weight 910,848 cwts. of flour, oatmeal, barley, oats, and wheat. The amount of butter exported in 1804, from Ireland, was worth, in money, 1,704,680*l.* sterling. The importation of ale and beer, from the immense manufactures now carrying on of these articles, was diminished to 3209 barrels, in the year 1804, from 111,920 barrels, which was the average importation per annum, taking from three years ending in 1792; and at present there is an export trade of porter. On an average of the three years ending March, 1783, there were imported into Ireland, of cotton wool, 3326 cwts., of cotton yarn, 5405 lbs.; but on an average of three years, ending January, 1803, there were imported, of the first article, 13,159 cwts., and of the latter, 628,406 lbs. It is impossible to conceive any manufacture more flourishing. The export of linen has increased in Ireland from 17,776,862 yards, the average in 1770, to 43,534,971 yards, the amount in 1805. The tillage of Ireland has more than trebled within the last twenty-one years. The importation of coals has increased from 230,000 tons, in 1783, to 417,030, in 1804; of tobacco, from 3,459,861 lbs. in 1783, to 6,611,543, in 1804; of tea, from 1,703,855 lbs. in 1783, to 3,358,256, in 1804; of sugar, from 143,117 cwts. in 1782, to 309,076, in 1804. Ireland now supports a funded debt of about 64 millions; and it is computed that more than three millions of money are annually remitted to Irish absentees resident in this country. In Mr. Foster's report, of 100 folio pages, presented to the House of Commons in the year 1806, the total expenditure of Ireland is stated at 9,760,013*l.* Ireland has increased about two-thirds in its population within twenty-five years; and yet, and in about the same space of time, its exports of beef, bullocks, cows, pork, swine, butter, wheat, barley, and oats, collectively taken, have doubled; and this in spite of two years' famine, and the presence of an immense army, that is always at hand to guard the most valuable appanage of our empire from joining our most inveterate enemies. Ireland has the greatest possible facilities for carrying on commerce with the whole of Europe. It contains, within a circuit of 750 miles, 66 secure harbours; and presents a western frontier against Great Britain, reaching from the Firth of Clyde, north, to the Bristol Channel, south, and varying in distance from 20 to 100 miles; so that the subjugation of Ireland would compel us to guard with ships and soldiers a new line of coast, certainly amounting, with all its sinuosities, to more than 700 miles — an addition of polemics, in our present state of hostility with all the world, which must highly gratify the vigorists, and give them an ample opportunity of displaying that foolish energy upon which their claims to distinction are

* In England 49,450.

founded. Such is the country which the Right Reverend the Chancellor of the Exchequer would drive into the arms of France; and for the conciliation of which we are requested to wait, as if it were one of those sinecure places which were given to Mr. Perceval snarling at the breast, and which cannot be abolished till his decease.

How sincerely and fervently have I often wished that the Emperor of the French had thought as Mr. Spencer Perceval does upon the subject of government; that he had entertained doubts and scruples upon the propriety of admitting the Protestants to an equality of rights with the Catholics, and that he had left in the middle of his empire these vigorous seeds of hatred and disaffection! But the world was never yet conquered by a blockhead. One of the very first measures we saw him recurring to was the complete establishment of religious liberty: if his subjects fought and paid as he pleased, he allowed them to believe as they pleased: the moment I saw this, my best hopes were lost. I perceived in a moment the kind of man we had to do with. I was well aware of the miserable ignorance and folly of this country upon the subject of toleration; and every year has been adding to the success of that game which it was clear he had the will and the ability to play against us.

You say Bonaparte is not in earnest upon the subject of religion, and that this is the cause of his tolerant spirit; but is it possible you can intend to give us such dreadful and unamiable notions of religion? Are we to understand that the moment a man is sincere he is narrow-minded; that persecution is the child of belief; and that a desire to leave all men in the quiet and unpunished exercise of their own creed can only exist in the mind of an infidel? Thank God! I know many men whose principles are as firm as they are expanded, who cling tenaciously to their own modification of the Christian faith, without the slightest disposition to force that modification upon other people. If Bonaparte is liberal in subjects of religion because he has no religion, is this a reason why we should be illiberal because we are Christians? If he owes this excellent quality to a vice, is that any reason why we may not owe it to a virtue? Toleration is a great good, and a good to be imitated, let it come from whom it will. If a sceptic is tolerant, it only shows that he is not foolish in practice as well as erroneous in theory. If a religious man is tolerant, it evinces that he is religious from thought and inquiry, because he exhibits in his conduct one of the most beautiful and important consequences of a religious mind, — an inviolable charity to all the honest varieties of human opinion.

Lord Sidmouth, and all the anti-Catholic people, little foresee that they will hereafter be the sport of the antiquary; that their prophecies of ruin and destruction from Catholic emancipation will be clapped into the notes of some quaint history, and be matter of pleasantry even to the sedulous housewife and the rural dean. There is always a copious supply of Lord Sidmouths in the world; nor is there one single source of human happiness, against which they have not uttered the most lugubrious predictions. Turnpike roads, navigable canals, inoculation, hops, tobacco, the Reformation, the Revolution — there are always a set of worthy and moderately-gifted men, who bawl out death and ruin upon every valuable change which the varying aspect of human affairs absolutely and imperiously requires. I have often thought that it would be extremely useful to make a collection of the hatred and abuse that all those changes have experienced, which are now admitted to be marked improvements in our condition. Such a history might make folly a little more modest, and suspicious of its own decisions.

Ireland, you say, since the Union, is to be considered as a part of the whole kingdom; and therefore, however Catholics may predominate in that particular spot, yet, taking the whole empire together, they are to be considered as a much more insignifi-

cant quota of the population. Consider them in what light you please, as part of the whole, or by themselves, or in what manner may be most consentaneous to the devices of your holy mind—I say in a very few words, if you do not relieve these people from the civil incapacities to which they are exposed, you will lose them; or you must employ great strength and much treasure in watching over them. In the present state of the world, you can afford to do neither the one nor the other. Having stated this, I shall leave you to be ruined, Puffendorf in hand (as Mr. Secretary Canning says), and to lose Ireland, just as you have found out what proportion the aggrieved people should bear to the whole population, before their calamities meet with redress. As for your parallel cases, I am no more afraid of deciding upon them than I am upon their prototype. If ever any one heresy should so far spread itself over the principality of Wales that the Established Church were left in a minority of one to four; if you had subjected these heretics to very severe civil privations; if the consequence of such privations were a universal state of disaffection among that caseous and wrathful people; and if at the same time you were at war with all the world, how can you doubt for a moment that I would instantly restore them to a state of the most complete civil liberty? What matters it under what name you put the same case? Common sense is not changed by appellations. I have said how I would act to Ireland, and I would act so to all the world.

I admit that, to a certain degree, the Government will lose the affections of the Orangemen by emancipating the Catholics; much less, however, at present, than three years past. The few men, who have ill-treated the whole crew, live in constant terror that the oppressed people will rise upon them and carry the ship into Brest:—they begin to find that it is a very tiresome thing to sleep every night with cocked pistols under their pillows, and to breakfast, dine, and sup with drawn hangers. They suspect that the privilege of beating and kicking the rest of the sailors is hardly worth all this anxiety, and that if the ship does ever fall into the hands of the disaffected, all the cruelties which they have experienced will be thoroughly remembered and amply repaid. To a short period of disaffection among the Orangemen, I confess I should not much object: my love of poetical justice does carry me as far as that; one summer's whipping, only one: the thumb-screw for a short season; a little light easy torturing between Lady-day and Michaelmas; a short specimen of Mr. Perceval's rigour. I have malice enough to ask this slight atonement for the groans and shrieks of the poor Catholics, unheard by any human tribunal, but registered by the Angel of God against their Protestant and enlightened oppressors.

Besides, if you who count ten so often can count five, you must perceive that it is better to have four friends and one enemy than four enemies and one friend; and the more violent the hatred of the Orangemen, the more certain the reconciliation of the Catholics. The disaffection of the Orangemen will be the Irish rainbow; when I see it, I shall be sure that the storm is over.

If those incapacities, from which the Catholics ask to be relieved, were to the mass of them only a mere feeling of pride, and if the question were respecting the attainment of privileges which could be of importance only to the highest of the sect, I should still say, that the pride of the mass was very naturally wounded by the degradation of their superiors. Indignity to George Rose would be felt by the smallest nummary gentleman in the king's employ; and Mr. John Bannister could not be indifferent to anything which happened to Mr. Canning. But the truth is, it is a most egregious mistake to suppose that the Catholics are contending merely for the fringes and feathers of their chiefs. I will give you a list, in my next Letter, of those privations which are represented to be of no consequence to anybody but

Lord Fingal, and some twenty or thirty of the principal persons of their sect. In the meantime, adieu, and be wise.

LETTER IX.

Dear Abraham,

No Catholic can be chief Governor or Governor of this Kingdom, Chancellor or Keeper of the Great Seal, Lord High Treasurer, Chief of any of the Courts of Justice, Chancellor of the Exchequer, Puisne Judge, Judge in the Admiralty, Master of the Rolls, Secretary of State, Keeper of the Privy Seal, Vice-Treasurer or his Deputy, Teller or Cashier of Exchequer, Auditor or General, Governor or Custos Rotulorum of Counties, Chief Governor's Secretary, Privy Councillor, King's Counsel, Sergeant, Attorney, Solicitor-General, Master in Chancery, Provost or Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, Postmaster-General, Master and Lieutenant-General of Ordnance, Commander-in-Chief, General on the Staff, Sheriff, Sub-Sheriff, Mayor, Bailiff, Recorder, Burgess, or any other officer in a City, or a Corporation. No Catholic can be guardian to a Protestant, and no priest guardian at all: no Catholic can be a gamekeeper, or have for sale, or otherwise, any arms or warlike stores: no Catholic can present to a living, unless he choose to turn Jew in order to obtain that privilege; the pecuniary qualification of Catholic jurors is made higher than that of Protestants, and no relaxation of the ancient rigorous code is permitted, unless to those who shall take an oath prescribed by 13 & 14 Geo. III. Now if this is not picking the plums out of the pudding, and leaving the mere batter to the Catholics, I know not what is. If it were merely the Privy Council, it would be (I allow) nothing but a point of honour for which the mass of Catholics were contending, the honour of being chief-mourners or pall-bearers to the country; but surely no man will contend that every barrister may not speculate upon the possibility of being a puisne Judge; and that every shopkeeper must not feel himself injured by his exclusion from borough offices.

One of the greatest practical evils which the Catholics suffer in Ireland is their exclusion from the offices of Sheriff and Deputy Sheriff. Nobody who is unacquainted with Ireland can conceive the obstacles which this opposes to the fair administration of justice. The formation of juries is now entirely in the hands of the Protestants; the lives, liberties, and properties of the Catholics in the hands of the juries; and this is the arrangement for the administration of justice in a country where religious prejudices are inflamed to the greatest degree of animosity! In this country, if a man be a foreigner, if he sell slippers, and sealing wax, and artificial flowers, we are so tender of human life that we take care half the number of persons who are to decide upon his fate should be men of similar prejudices and feelings with himself: but a poor Catholic in Ireland may be tried by twelve Percevals, and destroyed according to the manner of that gentleman in the name of the Lord, and with all the insulting forms of justice. I do not go the length of saying that deliberate and wilful injustice is done. I have no doubt that the Orange Deputy Sheriff thinks it would be a most unpardonable breach of his duty if he did not summon a Protestant panel. I can easily believe that a Protestant panel may conduct themselves very conscientiously in hanging the gentlemen of the crucifix; but I blame the law which does not guard the Catholic against the probable tenor of those feelings which must unconsciously influence the judgments of mankind. I detest that state of society which extends unequal degrees of protection to different creeds and persuasions; and I cannot describe to you the contempt I feel for a man who, calling himself a statesman, defends a system which fills the heart of every Irishman with treason, and makes his allegiance prudence, not choice.

I request to know if the vestry taxes in Ireland are a mere matter of

romantic feeling, which can affect only the Earl of Fingal? In a parish where there are four thousand Catholics and fifty Protestants, the Protestants may meet together in a vestry meeting, at which no Catholic has the right to vote, and tax all the lands in the parish 1*s.* 6*d.* per acre, or in the pound, I forget which, for the repairs of the church—and how has the necessity of these repairs been ascertained? A Protestant plumber has discovered that it wants new leading; a Protestant carpenter is convinced the timbers are not sound, and the glazier who hates holy water (as an accoucheur hates celibacy because he gets nothing by it) is employed to put in new sashes.

The grand juries in Ireland are the great scene of jobbing. They have a power of making a conuty rate to a considerable extent for roads, bridges, and other objects of general accommodation. "You suffer the road to be brought through my park, and I will have the bridge constructed in a situation where it will make a beautiful object to your house. You do my job, and I will do yours." These are the sweet and interesting subjects which occasionally occupy Milesian gentlemen while they are attendant upon this grand inquest of justice. But there is a religion, it seems, even in jobs; and it will be highly gratifying to Mr. Perceval to learn that no man in Ireland who believes in seven sacraments can carry a public road, or bridge, one yard out of the direction most beneficial to the public, and that nobody can cheat that public who does not expound the Scriptures in the purest and most orthodox manner. This will give pleasure to Mr. Perceval: but, from his unfairness upon these topics, I appeal to the justice and the proper feelings of Mr. Huskisson. I ask him if the human mind can experience a more dreadful sensation than to see its own jobs refused, and the jobs of another religion perpetually succeeding? I ask him his opinion of a jobless faith, of a creed which dooms a man through life to a lean and plunderless integrity. He knows that human nature cannot and will not bear it; and if we were to paint a political Tartarus, it would be an endless series of snug expectations, and cruel disappointments. These are a few of many dreadful inconveniences which the Catholics of all ranks suffer from the laws by which they are at present oppressed. Besides, look at human nature:—what is the history of all professions? Joel is to be brought up to the bar: has Mrs. Plymley the slightest doubt of his being Chancellor? Do not his two shrivelled aunts live in the certainty of seeing him in that situation, and of cutting out with their own hands his equity habiliments? And I could name a certain minister of the Gospel who does not, in the bottom of his heart, much differ from these opinions. Do you think that the fathers and mothers of the holy Catholic Church are not as absurd as Protestant papas and mammas? The probability I admit to be, in each particular case, that the sweet little blockhead will in fact never get a brief;—but I will venture to say, there is not a parent from the Giant's Causeway to Bantry Bay who does not conceive that his child is the unfortunate victim of the exclusion, and that nothing short of positive law could prevent his own dear pre-eminent Paddy from rising to the highest honours of the State. So with the army, and parliament; in fact, few are excluded; but, in imagination, all: you keep twenty or thirty Catholics out, and you lose the affections of four millions; and, let me tell you, that recent circumstances have by no means tended to diminish in the minds of men that hope of elevation beyond their own rank which is so congenial to our nature: from pleading for John Roe to taxing John Bull, from jesting for Mr. Pitt and writing in the Anti-Jacobin, to managing the affairs of Europe—these are leaps which seem to justify the fondest dreams of mothers and of aunts.

I do not say that the disabilities to which the Catholics are exposed amount to such intolerable grievances, that the strength and industry of a nation are overwhelmed by them: the increasing

prosperity of Ireland fully demonstrates to the contrary. But I repeat again, what I have often stated in the course of our correspondence, that your laws against the Catholics are exactly in that state in which you have neither the benefits of rigour nor of liberality: every law which prevented the Catholic from gaining strength and wealth is repealed; every law which can irritate remains; if you were determined to insult the Catholics, you should have kept them weak; if you resolved to give them strength, you should have ceased to insult them;—at present your conduct is pure unadulterated folly.

Lord Hawkesbury says, We heard nothing about the Catholics till we began to mitigate the laws against them; when we relieved them in part from this oppression they began to be disaffected. This is very true; but it proves just what I have said, that you have either done too much, or too little; and as there lives not, I hope, upon earth, so depraved a courtier that he would load the Catholics with their ancient chains, what absurdity it is then not to render their dispositions friendly, when you leave their arms and legs free!

You know, and many Englishmen know, what passes in China; but nobody knows or cares what passes in Ireland. At the beginning of the present reign, no Catholic could realise property, or carry on any business; they were absolutely annihilated, and had no more agency in the country than so many trees. They were like Lord Mulgrave's eloquence and Lord Camden's wit; the legislative bodies did not know of their existence. For these twenty-five years last past, the Catholics have been engaged in commerce; within that period the commerce of Ireland has doubled;—there are four Catholics at work for one Protestant, and eight Catholics at work for one Episcopalian; of course, the proportion which Catholic wealth bears to Protestant wealth is every year altering rapidly in favour of the Catholics. I have already told you what their purchases of land were the last year: since that period, I have been at some pains to find out the actual state of the Catholic wealth: it is impossible, upon such a subject, to arrive at complete accuracy; but I have good reason to believe that there are at present 2000 Catholics in Ireland, possessing an income from 500*l.* upwards, many of these with incomes of one, two, three and four thousand, and some amounting to fifteen and twenty thousand per annum:—and this is the kingdom, and these the people, for whose conciliation we are to wait, Heaven knows when, and Lord Hawkesbury why! As for me, I never think of the situation of Ireland without feeling the same necessity for immediate interference as I should do if I saw blood flowing from a great artery. I rush towards it with the instinctive rapidity of a man desirous of preventing death, and have no other feeling but that in a few seconds the patient may be no more.

I could not help smiling in the times of No Popery, to witness the loyal indignation of many persons at the attempt made by the last ministry to do something for the relief of Ireland. The general cry in the country was, that they would not see their beloved Monarch used ill in his old age, and that they would stand by him to the last drop of their blood. I respect good feelings, however erroneous be the occasions on which they display themselves; and therefore I saw in all this as much to admire as to blame. It was a species of affection, however, which reminded me very forcibly of the attachment displayed by the servants of the Russian ambassador, at the beginning of the last century. His Excellency happened to fall down in a kind of apoplectic fit, when he was paying a morning visit in the house of an acquaintance. The confusion was of course very great, and messengers were despatched, in every direction, to find a surgeon; who, upon his arrival, declared that his Excellency must be immediately blooded, and prepared himself forthwith to perform the operation: the barbarous servants of the embassy, who were there in great

numbers, no sooner saw the surgeon prepared to wound the arm of their master with a sharp shining instrument, than they drew their swords, put themselves in an attitude of defence, and swore in pure Sclavonic, "that they would murder any man who attempted to do him the slightest injury: he had been a very good master to them, and they would not desert him in his misfortunes, or suffer his blood to be shed while he was off his guard, and incapable of defending himself." By good fortune, the secretary arrived about this period of the dispute, and his Excellency, relieved from superfluous blood and perilous affection, was, after much difficulty, restored to life.

There is an argument brought forward with some appearance of plausibility in the House of Commons, which certainly merits an answer: You know that the Catholics now vote for members of parliament in Ireland, and that they outnumber the Protestants in a very great proportion; if you allow Catholics to sit in parliament, religion will be found to influence votes more than property, and the greater part of the 100 Irish members who are returned to parliament will be Catholics. —Add to these the Catholic members who are returned in England, and you will have a phalanx of heretical strength which every minister will be compelled to respect, and occasionally to conciliate by concessions incompatible with the interests of the Protestant Church. The fact is, however, that you are at this moment subjected to every danger of this kind which you can possibly apprehend hereafter. If the spiritual interests of the voters are more powerful than their temporal interests, they can bind down their representatives to support any measures favourable to the Catholic religion, and they can change the objects of their choice till they have found Protestant members (as they easily may do) perfectly obedient to their wishes. If the superior possessions of the Protestants prevent the Catholics from uniting for a common political object, then the danger you fear cannot exist: if zeal, on the contrary, gets the better of acres, then the danger at present exists, from the right of voting already given to the Catholics, and it will not be increased by allowing them to sit in parliament. There are, as nearly as I can recollect, thirty seats in Ireland for cities and counties, where the Protestants are the most numerous, and where the members returned must of course be Protestants. In the other seventy representations, the wealth of the Protestants is opposed to the number of the Catholics; and if all the seventy members returned were of the Catholic persuasion, they must still plot the destruction of our religion in the midst of 588 Protestants. Such terrors would disgrace a cook-maid, or a toothless aunt—when they fall from the lips of bearded and senatorial men, they are nauseous, antiperistaltic, and emetical.

How can you for a moment doubt of the rapid effects which would be produced by the emancipation?—In the first place, to my certain knowledge, the Catholics have long since expressed to his Majesty's ministers their perfect readiness *to vest in his Majesty, either with the consent of the Pope, or without it if it cannot be obtained, the nomination of the Catholic prelacy.* The Catholic prelacy in Ireland consists of twenty-six bishops and the warden of Galway, a dignitary enjoying Catholic jurisdiction. The number of Roman Catholic priests in Ireland exceeds one thousand. The expenses of his peculiar worship are, to a substantial farmer or mechanic, five shillings per annum; to a labourer (where he is not entirely excused) one shilling per annum; this includes the contribution of the whole family, and for this the priest is bound to attend them when sick, and to confess them when they apply to him: he is also to keep his chapel in order, to celebrate divine service, and to preach on Sundays and holydays. In the northern district a priest gains from 30*l.* to 50*l.*; in the other parts of Ireland from 60*l.* to 90*l.* per ann. The best paid Catholic bishops receive about 400*l.* per ann.; the others from 300*l.* to 350*l.* My plan is very simple; I would have

300 Catholic parishes at 100*l.* per ann., 300 at 200*l.* per ann., and 400 at 300*l.* per ann.; this, for the whole thousand parishes, would amount to 190,000*l.* To the prelacy I would allot 20,000*l.* in unequal proportions, from 1000*l.* to 500*l.*; and I would appropriate 40,000*l.* more for the support of Catholic schools, and the repairs of Catholic churches; the whole amount of which sum is 250,000*l.*, about the expense of three days of one of our genuine, good, English, *just and necessary wars.* The clergy should all receive their salaries at the Bank of Ireland, and I would place the whole patronage in the hands of the Crown. Now, I appeal to any human being, except Spencer Perceval, Esq., of the parish of Hampstead, what the disaffection of a clergy would amount to, gaping after this graduated bounty of the Crown, and whether Ignatius Loyola himself, if he were a living blockhead, instead of a dead saint, could withstand the temptation of bouncing from 100*l.* a year at Sligo, to 300*l.* in Tipperary? This is the miserable sum of money for which the merchants, and landowners, and nobility of England are exposing themselves to the tremendous peril of losing Ireland. The sinecure places of the Roses and the Percevals, and the "dear and near relations," put up to auction at thirty years' purchase, would almost amount to the money.

I admit that nothing can be more reasonable than to expect that a Catholic priest should starve to death, genteelly and pleasantly, for the good of the Protestant religion; but is it equally reasonable to expect that he should do so for the Protestant pews, and Protestant brick and mortar? On an Irish Sabbath, the bell of a neat parish church often summons to church only the parson and an occasionally conforming clerk; while, two hundred yards off, a thousand Catholics are huddled together in a miserable hovel, and pelted by all the storms of heaven. Can anything be more distressing than to see a venerable man pouring forth sublime truths in tattered breeches, and depending for his food upon the little offal he gets from his parishioners? I venerate a human being who starves for his principles, let them be what they may; but starving for anything is not at all to the taste of the honourable flagellants: strict principles, and good pay, is the motto of Mr. Perceval: the one he keeps in great measure for the faults of his enemies, the other for himself.

There are parishes in Connaught in which a Protestant was never settled, nor even seen: in that province, in Munster, and in parts of Leinster, the entire peasantry for sixty miles are Catholics; in these tracts the churches are frequently shut for want of a congregation, or opened to an assemblage of from six to twenty persons. Of what Protestants there are in Ireland, the greatest part are gathered together in Ulster, or they live in towns. In the country of the other three provinces the Catholics see no other religion but their own, and are at the least as fifteen to one Protestant. In the diocese of Tuam they are sixty to one; in the parish of St. Mullins, diocese of Leghlin, there are four thousand Catholics and *one Protestant*; in the town of Grasgenamana, in the county of Kilkenny, there are between four and five hundred Catholic houses, and three Protestant houses. In the parish of Allen, county Kildare, there is no Protestant, though it is very populous. In the parish of Arlesin, Queen's County, the proportion is one hundred to one. In the whole county of Kilkenny, by actual enumeration, it is seventeen to one; in the diocese of Kilmacduagh, province of Connaught, fifty-two to one, by ditto. These I give you as a few specimens of the present state of Ireland; — and yet there are men impudent and ignorant enough to contend that such evils require no remedy, and that mild family man who dwelleth in Hampstead can find none but the cautery and the knife,

> ——— omne per ignem
> Excoquitur vitium.

I cannot describe the horror and disgust which I felt at hearing Mr.

Perceval call upon the then ministry for measures of vigour in Ireland. If I lived at Hampstead upon stewed meats and claret; if I walked to church every Sunday before eleven young gentlemen of my own begetting, with their faces washed, and their hair pleasingly combed: if the Almighty had blessed me with every earthly comfort — how awfully would I pause before I sent forth the flame and the sword over the cabins of the poor, brave, generous, open-hearted peasants of Ireland! How easy it is to shed human blood — how easy it is to persuade ourselves that it is our duty to do so—and that the decision has cost us a severe struggle — how much in all ages have wounds and shrieks and tears been the cheap and vulgar resources of the rulers of mankind—how difficult and how noble it is to govern in kindness and to found an empire upon the everlasting basis of justice and affection!—But what do men call vigour? To let loose hussars and to bring up artillery, to govern with lighted matches, and to cut, and push, and prime—I call this, not vigour, but the *sloth of cruelty and ignorance.* The vigour I love consists in finding out wherein subjects are aggrieved, in relieving them, in studying the temper and genius of a people, in consulting their prejudices, in selecting proper persons to lead and manage them, in the laborious, watchful, and difficult task of increasing public happiness by allaying each particular discontent. In this way Hoche pacified La Vendée —and in this way only will Ireland ever be subdued. But this, in the eyes of Mr. Perceval, is imbecility and meanness: houses are not broken open —women are not insulted—the people seem all to be happy; they are not rode over by horses, and cut by whips. Do you call this vigour? — Is this government?

LETTER X. AND LAST.

You must observe that all I have said of the effects which will be produced by giving salaries to the Catholic Clergy, only proceeds upon the supposition that the emancipation of the laity is effected:—without that, I am sure there is not a clergyman in Ireland who would receive a shilling from government; he could not do so, without an entire loss of credit among the members of his own persuasion.

What you say of the moderation of the Irish Protestant Clergy in collecting tithes, is, I believe, strictly true. Instead of collecting what the law enables them to collect, I believe they seldom or ever collect more than two thirds; and I entirely agree with you, that the abolition of agistment tithe in Ireland by a vote of the Irish House of Commons, and without any remuneration to the Church, was a most scandalous and Jacobinical measure. I do not blame the Irish clergy; but I submit to your common sense, if it be possible to explain to an Irish peasant upon what principle of justice, or common sense, he is to pay every tenth potato in his little garden to a clergyman in whose religion nobody believes for twenty miles around him, and who has nothing to preach to but bare walls. It is true, if the tithes are bought up, the cottager must pay more rent to his landlord; but the same thing done in the shape of rent, is less odious than when it is done in the shape of tithe. I do not want to take a shilling out of the pockets of the clergy, but to leave the substance of things, and to change their names. I cannot see the slightest reason why the Irish labourer is to be relieved from the real onus, or from anything else but the name of tithe. At present he rents only nine tenths of the produce of the land; which is all that belongs to the owner; this he has at the market price; if the landowner purchase the other tenth of the Church, of course he has a right to make a correspondent advance upon his tenant.

I very much doubt, if you were to lay open all civil offices to the Catholics, and to grant salaries to their clergy, in the manner I have stated, if the Catholic laity would give themselves much trouble about the advance of their Church; for they would pay the same tithes under one system that they do under another. If you were to

bring the Catholics into the daylight of the world, to the high situations of the army, the navy, and the bar, numbers of them would come over to the Established Church, and do as other people do; instead of that, you set a mark of infamy upon them, rouse every passion of our nature in favour of their creed, and then wonder that men are blind to the follies of the Catholic religion. There are hardly any instances of old and rich families among the Protestant Dissenters: when a man keeps a coach, and lives in good company, he comes to church, and gets ashamed of the meeting-house; if this is not the case with the father, it is almost always the case with the son. These things would never be so, if the Dissenters were in *practice* as much excluded from all the concerns of civil life, as the Catholics are. If a rich young Catholic were in parliament, he would belong to White's and to Brookes's, would keep race-horses, would walk up and down Pall Mall, be exonerated of his ready money and his constitution, become as totally devoid of morality, honesty, knowledge, and civility as Protestant loungers in Pall Mall, and return home with a supreme contempt for Father O'Leary and Father O'Callaghan. I am astonished at the madness of the Catholic clergy, in not perceiving that Catholic emancipation is Catholic infidelity; that to entangle their people in the intrigues of a Protestant parliament, and a Protestant Court, is to insure the loss of every man of fashion and consequence in their community. The true receipt for preserving their religion, is Mr. Perceval's receipt for destroying it: it is to deprive every rich Catholic of all the objects of secular ambition, to separate him from the Protestant, and to shut him up in his castle with priests and relics.

We are told, in answer to all our arguments, that this is not a fit period,—that a period of universal war is not the proper time for dangerous innovations in the constitution: this is as much as to say, that the worst time for making friends is the period when you have made many enemies; that it is the greatest of all errors to stop when you are breathless, and to lie down when you are fatigued. Of one thing I am quite certain: if the safety of Europe is once completely restored, the Catholics may for ever bid adieu to the slightest probability of effecting their object. Such men as hang about a court not only are deaf to the suggestions of mere justice, but they despise justice; they detest the word *right;* the only word which rouses them is *peril;* where they can oppress with impunity, they oppress for ever, and call it loyalty and wisdom.

I am so far from conceiving the legitimate strength of the Crown would be diminished by those abolitions of civil incapacities in consequence of religious opinions, that my only objection to the increase of religious freedom is, that it would operate as a diminution of political freedom: the power of the Crown is so overbearing at this period, that almost the only steady opposers of its fatal influence are men disgusted by religious intolerance. Our establishments are so enormous, and so utterly disproportioned to our population, that every second or third man you meet in society gains something from the public; my brother the commissioner,—my nephew the police justice,—purveyor of small beer to the army in Ireland,—clerk of the mouth,—yeoman to the left hand,—these are the obstacles which common sense and justice have now to overcome. Add to this, that the King, old and infirm, excites a principle of very amiable generosity in his favour; that he has led a good, moral, and religious life, equally removed from profligacy and methodistical hypocrisy; that he has been a good husband, a good father, and a good master; that he dresses plain, loves hunting and farming, hates the French, and is, in all his opinions and habits, quite English:—these feelings are heightened by the present situation of the world, and the yet unexploded clamour of Jacobinism. In short, from the various sources of interest, personal regard, and national taste, such a tempest of loyalty has set in upon the people that the 47th proposition in Euclid might now be voted down with

as much ease as any proposition in politics; and therefore if Lord Hawkesbury hates the abstract truths of science as much as he hates concrete truth in human affairs, now is his time for getting rid of the multiplication table, and passing a vote of censure upon the pretensions of the *hypotheneuse*. Such is the history of English parties at this moment: you cannot seriously suppose that the people care for such men as Lord Hawkesbury, Mr. Canning, and Mr. Perceval, on their own account; you cannot really believe them to be so degraded as to look to their safety from a man who proposes to subdue Europe by keeping it without Jesuits' Bark. The people, at present, have one passion, and but one—

A Jove principium, Jovis omnia plena.

They care no more for the ministers I have mentioned, than they do for those sturdy royalists who for 60*l.* per annum stand behind his Majesty's carriage, arrayed in scarlet and gold. If the present ministers opposed the Court instead of flattering it, they would not command twenty votes.

Do not imagine by these observations that I am not loyal: without joining in the common cant of the best of kings, I respect the King most sincerely as a good man. His religion is better than the religion of Mr. Perceval, his old morality very superior to the old morality of Mr. Canning, and I am quite certain he has a safer understanding than both of them put together. Loyalty within the bounds of reason and moderation, is one of the greatest instruments of English happiness; but the love of the King may easily become more strong than the love of the kingdom, and we may lose sight of the public welfare in our exaggerated admiration of him who is appointed to reign only for its promotion and support. I detest Jacobinism; and if I am doomed to be a slave at all, I would rather be the slave of a king than a cobbler. God save the King, you say, warms your heart like the sound of a trumpet. I cannot make use of so violent a metaphor; but I am delighted to hear it, when it is the cry of genuine affection; I am delighted to hear it, when they hail not only the individual man, but the outward and living sign of all English blessings. These are noble feelings, and the heart of every good man must go with them; but God save the King, in these times, too often means God save my pension and my place, God give my sisters an allowance out of the privy purse,—make me clerk of the irons, let me survey the meltings, let me live upon the fruits of other men's industry, and fatten upon the plunder of the public.

What is it possible to say to such a man as the Gentleman of Hampstead, who really believes it feasible to convert the four million Irish Catholics to the Protestant religion, and considers this as the best remedy for the disturbed state of Ireland? It is not possible to answer such a man with arguments; we must come out against him with beads, and a cowl, and push him into an hermitage. It is really such trash, that it is an abuse of the privilege of reasoning to reply to it. Such a project is well worthy the statesman who would bring the French to reason by keeping them without rhubarb, and exhibit to mankind the awful spectacle of a nation deprived of neutral salts. This is not the dream of a wild apothecary indulging in his own opium; this is not the distempered fancy of a pounder of drugs, delirious from smallness of profits: but it is the sober, deliberate, and systematic scheme of a man to whom the public safety is entrusted, and whose appointment is considered by many as a masterpiece of political sagacity. What a sublime thought, that no purge can now be taken between the Weser and the Garonne; that the bustling pestle is still, the canorous mortar mute, and the bowels of mankind locked up for fourteen degrees of latitude! When, I should be curious to know, were all the powers of crudity and flatulence fully explained to his Majesty's ministers? At what period was this great plan of conquest and constipation fully developed? In whose mind was the idea of destroying the pride and the plasters of France first engendered? Without castor oil

they might, for some months, to be sure, have carried on a lingering war; but can they do without bark? Will the people live under a government where antimonial powders cannot be procured? Will they bear the loss of mercury? "There's the rub." Depend upon it, the absence of the materia medica will soon bring them to their senses, and the cry of *Bourbon and bolus* burst forth from the Baltic to the Mediterranean.

You ask me for any precedent in our history where the oath of supremacy has been dispensed with. It was dispensed with to the Catholics of Canada in 1774. They are only required to take a simple oath of allegiance. The same, I believe, was the case in Corsica. The reason of such exemption was obvious; you could not possibly have retained either of these countries without it. And what did it signify, whether you retained them or not? In cases where you might have been foolish without peril, you were wise; when nonsense and bigotry threaten you with destruction, it is impossible to bring you back to the alphabet of justice and common sense. If men are to be fools, I would rather they were fools in little matters than in great; dulness turned up with temerity, is a livery all the worse for the facings; and the most tremendous of all things is the magnanimity of a dunce.

It is not by any means necessary, as you contend, to repeal the Test Act if you give relief to the Catholic; what the Catholics ask for is to be put on a footing with the Protestant Dissenters, which would be done by repealing that part of the law which compels them to take the oath of supremacy and to make the declaration against transubstantiation: they would then come into parliament as all other Dissenters are allowed to do, and the penal laws to which they were exposed for taking office would be suspended every year, as they have been for this half century past towards Protestant Dissenters. Perhaps, after all, this is the best method,—to continue the persecuting law, and to suspend it every year,—a method which, while it effectually destroys the persecution itself, leaves to the great mass of mankind the exquisite gratification of supposing that they are enjoying some advantage from which a particular class of their fellow-creatures are excluded. We manage the Corporation and Test Acts at present much in the same manner as if we were to persuade parish boys who had been in the habit of beating an ass to spare the animal, and beat the skin of an ass stuffed with straw; this would preserve the semblance of tormenting without the reality, and keep boy and beast in good humour.

How can you imagine that a provision for the Catholic clergy affects the 5th article of the Union? Surely I am preserving the Protestant Church in Ireland, if I put it in a better condition than that in which it now is. A tithe proctor in Ireland collects his tithes with a blunderbuss, and carries his tenth hay-cock by storm, sword in hand: to give him equal value in a more pacific shape cannot, I should imagine, be considered as injurious to the Church of Ireland; and what right has that Church to complain, if parliament chooses to fix upon the empire the burthen of supporting a double ecclesiastical establishment? Are the revenues of the Irish Protestant clergy in the slightest degree injured by such provision? On the contrary, is it possible to confer a more serious benefit upon that Church, than by quieting and contenting those who are at work for its destruction?

It is impossible to think of the affairs of Ireland without being forcibly struck with the parallel of Hungary. Of her seven millions of inhabitants, one half were Protestants, Calvinists, and Lutherans, many of the Greek Church, and many Jews; such was the state of their religious dissensions, that Mahomet had often been called in to the aid of Calvin, and the crescent often glittered on the walls of Buda and of Presburg. At last, in 1791, during the most violent crisis of disturbance, a diet was called, and by a great majority of voices a decree was passed,

which secured to all the contending sects the fullest and freest exercise of religious worship and education; ordained (let it be heard in Hampstead) that churches and chapels should be erected for all on the most perfectly equal terms; that the Protestants of both confessions should depend upon their spiritual superiors alone; liberated them from swearing by the usual oath, "the holy Virgin Mary, the saints, and chosen of God;" and then the decree adds, "that *public offices and honours, high or low, great or small, shall be given to natural-born Hungarians who deserve well of their country, and possess the other qualifications, let their religion be what it may.*" Such was the line of policy pursued in a diet consisting of four hundred members, in a state whose form of government approaches nearer to our own than any other, having a Roman Catholic establishment of great wealth and power, and under the influence of one of the most bigoted Catholic Courts in Europe. This measure has now the experience of eighteen years in its favour; it has undergone a trial of fourteen years of revolution such as the world never witnessed, and more than equal to a century less convulsed: What have been its effects? When the French advanced like a torrent within a few days' march of Vienna, the Hungarians rose in a mass; they formed what they called the sacred insurrection, to defend their sovereign, their rights, and liberties, now common to all; and the apprehension of their approach dictated to the reluctant Bonaparte the immediate signature of the treaty of *Leoben*. The Romish hierarchy of Hungary exists in all its former splendour and opulence; never has the slightest attempt been made to diminish it; and those revolutionary principles, to which so large a portion of civilised Europe has been sacrificed, have here failed in making the smallest successful inroad.

The whole history of this proceeding of the Hungarian Diet is so extraordinary, and such an admirable comment upon the Protestantism of Mr. Spencer Perceval, that I must compel you to read a few short extracts from the law itself:—"The Protestants of both confessions shall, in religious matters, depend upon their own spiritual superiors alone. The Protestants may likewise retain their trivial and grammar schools. The Church dues which the Protestants have hitherto paid to the Catholic parish priests, schoolmasters, or other such officers, either in money, productions, or labour shall in future entirely cease, and after three months from the publishing of this law, be no more anywhere demanded. In the building or repairing of churches, parsonage-houses, and schools, the Protestants are not obliged to assist the Catholics with labour, nor the Catholics the Protestants. The pious foundations and donations of the Protestants which already exist, or which in future may be made for their churches, ministers, schools and students, hospitals, orphan-houses and poor, cannot be taken from them under any pretext, nor yet the care of them; but rather the unimpeded administration shall be entrusted to those from among them to whom it legally belongs, and those foundations which may have been taken from them under the last government, shall be returned to them without delay. All affairs of marriage of the Protestants are left to their own consistories; all landlords and masters of families, under the penalty of public persecution, are ordered not to prevent their subjects and servants, whether they be Catholic or Protestant, from the observance of the festivals and ceremonies of their religion." &c. &c. &c. — By what strange chances are mankind influenced! A little Catholic barrister of Vienna might have raised the cry of *No Protestantism*, and Hungary would have panted for the arrival of a French army as much as Ireland does at this moment; arms would have been searched for; Lutheran and Calvinist houses entered in the dead of the night; and the strength of Austria exhausted in guarding a country from which, under the present liberal system, she may expect, in a moment of danger, the most powerful aid: and let it be remembered, that this memo-

rable example of political wisdom took place at a period when many great monarchies were yet unconquered in Europe; in a country where the two religious parties were equal in number; and where it is impossible to suppose indifference in the party which relinquished its exclusive privileges. Under all these circumstances, the measure was carried in the Hungarian Diet by a majority of 280 to 120. In a few weeks, we shall see every concession denied to the Catholics by a much larger majority of Protestants, at a moment when every other power is subjugated but ourselves, and in a country where the oppressed are four times as numerous as their oppressors. So much for the wisdom of our ancestors—so much for the nineteenth century—so much for the superiority of the English over all the nations of the Continent.

Are you not sensible, let me ask you, of the absurdity of trusting the lowest Catholics with offices correspondent to their situation in life, and of denying such privilege to the higher? A Catholic may serve in the militia, but a Catholic cannot come into Parliament; in the latter case you suspect combination, and in the former case you suspect no combination; you deliberately arm ten or twenty thousand of the lowest of the Catholic people;—and the moment you come to a class of men whose education, honour, and talents, seem to render all mischief less probable, then you see the danger of employing a Catholic, and cling to your investigating tests and disabling laws. If you tell me you have enough of members of Parliament, and not enough of militia, without the Catholics, I beg leave to remind you, that, by employing the physical force of any sect, at the same time when you leave them in a state of utter disaffection, you are not adding strength to your armies, but weakness and ruin.—If you want the vigour of their common people, you must not disgrace their nobility, and insult their priesthood.

I thought that the terror of the Pope had been confined to the limits of the nursery, and merely employed as a means to induce young master to enter into his small-clothes with greater speed, and to eat his breakfast with greater attention to decorum. For these purposes, the name of the Pope is admirable; but why push it beyond? Why not leave to Lord Hawkesbury all further enumeration of the Pope's powers? For a whole century, you have been exposed to the enmity of France, and your succession was disputed in two rebellions; what could the Pope do at the period when there was a serious struggle, whether England should be Protestant or Catholic, and when the issue was completely doubtful? Could the Pope induce the Irish to rise in 1715? Could he induce them to rise in 1745? You had no Catholic enemy when half this island was in arms; and what did the Pope attempt in the last rebellion in Ireland? But if he had as much power over the minds of the Irish as Mr. Wilberforce has over the mind of a young Methodist converted the preceding quarter, is this a reason why we are to disgust men, who may be acted upon in such a manner by a foreign power? or is it not an additional reason why we should raise up every barrier of affection and kindness against the mischief of foreign influence? But the true answer is, the mischief does not exist. Gog and Magog have produced as much influence upon human affairs as the Pope has done for this half century past; and by spoiling him of his possessions, and degrading him in the eyes of all Europe, Bonaparte has not taken quite the proper method of increasing his influence.

But why not a Catholic king, as well as a Catholic member of Parliament, or of the Cabinet?—Because it is probable that the one would be mischievous, and the other not. A Catholic king might struggle against the Protestantism of the country, and if the struggle were not successful, it would at least be dangerous; but the efforts of any other Catholic would be quite insignificant, and his hope of success so small, that it is quite improbable the effort would ever be made: my argument is,

that in so Protestant a country as Great Britain, the character of her parliaments and her cabinet could not be changed by the few Catholics who would ever find their way to the one or the other. But the power of the Crown is immeasurably greater than the power which the Catholics could obtain from any other species of authority in the state; and it does not follow, because the lesser degree of power is innocent, that the greater should be so too. As for the stress you lay upon the danger of a Catholic chancellor, I have not the least hesitation in saying, that his appointment would not do a ten thousandth part of the mischief to the English Church that might be done by a Methodistical chancellor of the true Clapham breed; and I request to know, if it is really so very necessary that a chancellor should be of the religion of the Church of England, how many chancellors you have had within the last century who have been bred up in the Presbyterian religion?—And again, how many you have had who notoriously have been without any religion at all?

Why are you to suppose that eligibility and election are the same thing, and that all the cabinet *will* be Catholics whenever all the cabinet *may* be Catholics? You have a right, you say, to suppose an extreme case, and to argue upon it—so have I: and I will suppose that the hundred Irish members will one day come down in a body, and pass a law compelling the King to reside in Dublin. I will suppose that the Scotch members, by a similar stratagem, will lay England under a large contribution of meal and sulphur: no measure is without objection, if you sweep the whole horizon for danger; it is not sufficient to tell me of what may happen, but you must show me a rational probability that it will happen: after all, I might, contrary to my real opinion, admit all your dangers to exist; it is enough for me to contend, that all other dangers taken together are not equal to the danger of losing Ireland from disaffection and invasion.

I am astonished to see you, and many good and well-meaning clergymen beside you, painting the Catholics in such detestable colours; two thirds, at least, of Europe are Catholics,—they are Christians, though mistaken Christians; how can I possibly admit that any sect of Christians, and above all, that the oldest and the most numerous sect of Christians, are incapable of fulfilling the common duties and relations of life: though I do differ from them in many particulars, God forbid I should give such a handle to infidelity, and subscribe to such blasphemy against our common religion!

Do you think mankind never change their opinions without formally expressing and confessing that change? When you quote the decisions of ancient Catholic councils, are you prepared to defend all the decrees of English convocations and universities since the reign of Queen Elizabeth? I could soon make you sick of your uncandid industry against the Catholics, and bring you to allow that it is better to forget times past, and to judge and be judged by present opinions and present practice.

I must beg to be excused from explaining and refuting all the mistakes about the Catholics made by my Lord Redesdale; and I must do that nobleman the justice to say, that he has been treated with great disrespect. Could anything be more indecent than to make it a morning lounge in Dublin to call upon his Lordship, and to cram him with Arabian-night stories about the Catholics? Is this proper behaviour to the representative of Majesty, the child of Themis, and the keeper of the conscience in West Britain? Whoever reads the Letters of the Catholic Bishops, in the Appendix to Sir John Hippesly's very sensible book, will see to what an excess this practice must have been carried with the pleasing and Protestant nobleman whose name I have mentioned, and from thence I wish you to receive your answer about excommunication, and all the trash which is talked against the Catholics.

A sort of notion has, by some means or another, crept into the world, that

difference of religion would render men unfit to perform together the offices of common and civil life: that Brother Wood and Brother Grose could not travel together the same circuit if they differed in creed, nor Cockell and Mingay be engaged in the same cause if Cockell was a Catholic and Mingay a Muggletonian. It is supposed that Huskisson and Sir Harry Englefield would squabble behind the Speaker's chair about the Council of Lateran, and many a turnpike bill miscarry by the sarcastical controversies of Mr. Hawkins Brown and Sir John Throckmorton upon the real presence. I wish I could see some of these symptoms of earnestness upon the subject of religion; but it really seems to me that, in the present state of society, men no more think about inquiring concerning each other's faith than they do concerning the colour of each other's skins. There may have been times in England when the quarter sessions would have been disturbed by theological polemics: but now, after a Catholic justice had once been seen on the bench and it had been clearly ascertained that he spoke English, had no tail, only a single row of teeth, and that he loved port wine,—after all the scandalous and infamous reports of his physical conformation had been clearly proved to be false,—he would be reckoned a jolly fellow, and very superior in flavour to a sly Presbyterian. Nothing, in fact, can be more uncandid and unphilosophical* than to say that a man has a tail, because you cannot agree with him upon religious subjects; it appears to be ludicrous: but I am convinced it has done infinite mischief to the Catholics, and made a very serious impression upon the minds of many gentlemen of large landed property.

In talking of the impossibility of Catholic and Protestant living together with equal privilege under the same government, do you forget the Cantons of Switzerland? You might have seen there a Protestant congregation going into a church which had just been quitted by a Catholic congregation; and I will venture to say that the Swiss Catholics were more bigoted to their religion than any people in the whole world. Did the kings of Prussia ever refuse to employ a Catholic? Would Frederick the Great have rejected an able man on this account? We have seen Prince Czartorinski, a Catholic secretary of state in Russia; in former times, a Greek patriarch and an apostolic vicar acted together in the most perfect harmony in Venice; and we have seen the Emperor of Germany in modern times entrusting the care of his person and the command of his guard to a Protestant Prince, Ferdinand of Wirtemberg. But what are all these things to Mr. Perceval? He has looked at human nature from the top of Hampstead Hill, and has not a thought beyond the little sphere of his own vision. "The snail," say the Hindoos, "sees nothing but his own shell, and thinks it the grandest palace in the universe."

I now take a final leave of this subject of Ireland; the only difficulty in discussing it is a want of resistance, a want of something difficult to unravel, and something dark to illumine. To agitate such a question is to beat the air with a club, and cut down gnats with a scimitar; it is a prostitution of industry, and a waste of strength. If a man say, I have a good place, and I do not choose to lose it, this mode of arguing upon the Catholic question I can well understand; but that any human being with an understanding two degrees elevated above that of an Anabaptist preacher, should conscientiously contend for the expediency and propriety of leaving the Irish Catholics in their present state, and of subjecting us to such tremendous peril in the present condition of the world, it is utterly out of my power to conceive. Such a measure as the Catholic question is entirely beyond the common game of politics; it is a measure in which all parties ought to acquiesce, in order to preserve the place where and the stake for which they play. If Ireland is gone, where are jobs? where are reversions? where is my brother, Lord

* *Vide* Lord Bacon, Locke, and Descartes.

Arden? where are my dear and near relations? The game is up, and the Speaker of the House of Commons will be sent as a present to the menagerie at Paris. We talk of waiting from particular considerations, as if centuries of joy and prosperity were before us: in the next ten years our fate must be decided; we shall know, long before that period, whether we can bear up against the miseries by which we are threatened, or not: and yet, in the very midst of our crisis, we are enjoined to abstain from the most certain means of increasing our strength, and advised to wait for the remedy till the disease is removed by death or health. And now, instead of the plain and manly policy of increasing unanimity at home, by equalising rights and privileges, what is the ignorant, arrogant, and wicked system which has been pursued? Such a career of madness and of folly was, I believe, never run in so short a period. The vigour of the ministry is like the vigour of a gravedigger,—the tomb becomes more ready and more wide for every effort which they make. There is nothing which it is worth while either to take or to retain, and a constant train of ruinous expeditions have been kept up. Every Englishman felt proud of the integrity of his country; the character of the country is lost for ever. It is of the utmost consequence to a commercial people at war with the greatest part of Europe, that there should be a free entry of neutrals into the enemy's ports; the neutrals who carried our manufactures we have not only excluded, but we have compelled them to declare war against us. It was our interest to make a good peace, or convince our own people that it could not be obtained; we have not made a peace, and we have convinced the people of nothing but of the arrogance of the Foreign Secretary: and all this has taken place in the short space of a year, because a King's Bench barrister and a writer of epigrams, turned into Ministers of State, were determined to show country gentlemen that the late administration had no vigour. In the meantime commerce stands still, manufactures perish, Ireland is more and more irritated, India is threatened, fresh taxes are accumulated upon the wretched people, the war is carried on without it being possible to conceive any one single object which a rational being can propose to himself by its continuation; and in the midst of this unparalleled insanity we are told that the Continent is to be reconquered by the want of rhubarb and plums.* A better spirit than exists in the English people never existed in any people in the world; it has been misdirected, and squandered upon party purposes in the most degrading and scandalous manner; they have been led to believe that they were benefiting the commerce of England by destroying the commerce of America, that they were defending their Sovereign by perpetuating the bigoted oppression of their fellow-subjects; their rulers and their guides have told them that they would equal the vigour of France by equalling her atrocity; and they have gone on wasting that opulence, patience, and courage, which, if husbanded by prudent and moderate counsels, might have proved the salvation of mankind. The same policy of turning the good qualities of Englishmen to their own destruction, which made Mr. Pitt omnipotent, continues his power to those who resemble him only in his vices; advantage is taken of the loyalty of Englishmen to make them meanly submissive; their piety is turned into persecution, their courage into useless and obstinate contention; they are plundered because they are ready to pay, and soothed into asinine stupidity because they are full of virtuous patience. If England must perish at last, so let it be; that event is in the hands of God; we must dry up our tears and submit. But that England should perish swindling and stealing; that it should perish waging war against lazar houses, and hospitals; that it should perish persecuting with

* Even Allen Park (accustomed as he has always been to be delighted by all administrations) says it is too bad; and Hall and Morris are said to have actually blushed in one of the divisions.

monastic bigotry; that it should calmly give itself up to be ruined by the flashy arrogance of one man, and the narrow fanaticism of another; these events are within the power of human beings, and I did not think that the magnanimity of Englishmen would ever stoop to such degradations.

Longum vale!

PETER PLYMLEY.

THE JUDGE THAT SMITES CONTRARY TO THE LAW.

A SERMON

PREACHED IN THE CATHEDRAL CHURCH OF ST. PETER, YORK

BEFORE

THE HON. SIR JOHN BAYLEY, KNT.

AND

THE HON. SIR GEORGE SOWLEY HOLROYD, KNT.

JUSTICES OF THE COURT OF KING'S BENCH

MARCH 28, 1824.

ACTS, XXIII. 3.

Sittest thou here to judge me after the law, and commandest thou me to be smitten, contrary to the law?

WITH these bold words St. Paul repressed the unjust violence of that ruler, who would have silenced his arguments, and extinguished his zeal for the Christian faith: knowing well the misfortunes which awaited him, prepared for deep and various calamity, not ignorant of the violence of the Jewish multitude, not unused to suffer, not unwilling to die, he had not prepared himself for the monstrous spectacle of perverted Justice; but losing that spirit to whose fire and firmness we owe the very existence of the Christian faith, he burst into that bold rebuke which brought back the extravagance of power under the control of law, and branded it with the feelings of shame: "Sittest thou here to judge me after the law, and commandest thou me to be smitten, contrary to the law?"

I would observe that in the Gospels, and the various parts of the New Testament, the words of our Saviour and of St. Paul, when they contain any opinion, are always to be looked upon as lessons of wisdom to us, however incidentally they may have been delivered, and however shortly they may have been expressed. As their words were to be recorded by inspired writers, and to go down to future ages, nothing can have been said without reflection and design. Nothing is to be lost, everything is to be studied: a great moral lesson is often conveyed in a few words. Read slowly, think deeply, let every word enter into your soul, for it was intended for your soul.

I take these words of St. Paul as a condemnation of that man who smites contrary to the law; as a praise of that man who judges according to the law; as a religious theme upon the importance of human Justice to the happiness of mankind: and if it be that theme, it is appropriate to this place, and to the solemn public duties of the past and the ensuing week, over which some here present will preside, at which

many here present will assist, and which almost all here present will witness.

I will discuss, then, the importance of judging according to the law, or, in other words, of the due administration of Justice upon the character and happiness of nations. And in so doing, I will begin with stating a few of those circumstances which may mislead even good and conscientious men, and subject them to the unchristian sin of smiting contrary to the law. I will state how that Justice is purified and perfected, by which the happiness and character of nations is affected to a good purpose.

I do this with less fear of being misunderstood, because I am speaking before two great magistrates, who have lived much among us; and whom — because they have lived much among us — we have all learned to respect and regard, and to whom no man fears to consider himself as accountable, because all men see that they, in the administration of their high office, consider themselves as deeply and daily accountable to God.

And let no man say, "Why teach such things? Do you think they must not have occurred to those to whom they are a concern?" I answer to this that no man preaches novelties and discoveries; the object of preaching is, constantly to remind mankind of what mankind are constantly forgetting; not to supply the defects of human intelligence, but to fortify the feebleness of human resolutions, to recall mankind from the by-paths where they turn, into that broad path of salvation which all know, but few tread. These plain lessons the humblest ministers of the Gospel may teach, if they are honest, and the most powerful Christians will ponder, if they are wise. No man, whether he bear the sword of the law, or whether he bear that sceptre which the sword of the law cannot reach, can answer for his own heart tomorrow, and can say to the teacher,— "Thou warnest me, thou teachest me, in vain."

A Christian Judge, in a free land, should, with the most scrupulous exactness, guard himself from the influence of those party feelings, upon which, perhaps, the preservation of political liberty depends, but by which the better reason of individuals is often blinded and the tranquillity of the public disturbed. I am not talking of the ostentatious display of such feelings; I am hardly talking of any gratification of which the individual himself is conscious, but I am raising up a wise and useful jealousy of the encroachment of those feelings, which, when they do encroach, lessen the value of the most valuable, and lower the importance of the most important, men in the country. I admit it to be extremely difficult to live amidst the agitations, contests, and discussions of a free people, and to remain in that state of cool, passionless Christian candour, which society expect from their great magistrates; but it is the pledge that magistrate has given, it is the life he has taken up, it is the class of qualities which he has promised us, and for which he has rendered himself responsible: it is the same fault in him which want of courage would be in some men, and want of moral regularity in others. It runs counter to those very purposes, and sins against those utilities for which the very office was created: without these qualities, he who ought to be cool, is heated; he who ought to be neutral, is partial: the ermine of Justice is spotted; the balance of Justice is unpoised; the fillet of Justice is torn off: and he who sits to judge after the law, smites contrary to the law.

And if the preservation of calmness amidst the strong feelings by which a Judge is surrounded be difficult, is it not also honourable? and would it be honourable if it were not difficult? Why do men quit their homes, and give up their common occupations, and repair to the tribunal of Justice? Why this bustle and business, why this decoration and display, and why are we all eager to pay our homage to the dispensers of Justice? Because we all feel that there must be, somewhere or other, a check to human passions; because we all know the immense value and importance of men, in whose placid

equity and mediating wisdom, we can trust in the worst of times ; because we cannot cherish too strongly and express too plainly, that reverence we feel for men, who can rise up in the ship of the state, and rebuke the storms of the mind, and bid its angry passions be still.

A Christian Judge in a free land, should not only keep his mind clear from the violence of party feelings, but he should be very careful to preserve his independence, by seeking no promotion, and asking no favours from those who govern : or at least, to be (which is an experiment not without danger to his salvation) so thoroughly confident of his motives and his conduct, that he is certain the hope of favour to come, or gratitude for favour past, will never cause him to swerve from the strict line of duty. It is often the lot of a Judge to be placed, not only between the accuser and the accused, not only between the complainant and him against whom it is complained, but between the governors and the governed, between the people and those whose lawful commands the people are bound to obey. In these sort of contests it unfortunately happens that the rulers are sometimes as angry as the ruled; the whole eyes of a nation are fixed upon one man, and upon his character and conduct the stability and happiness of the times seem to depend. The best and firmest magistrates cannot tell how they may act under such circumstances, but every man may prepare himself for acting well under such circumstances, by cherishing that quiet feeling of independence, which removes one temptation to act ill. Every man may avoid putting himself in a situation where his hopes of advantage are on one side, and his sense of duty on the other : such a temptation may be withstood, but it is better it should not be encountered. Far better that feeling which says, "I have vowed a vow before God; I have put on the robe of justice; farewell avarice, farewell ambition : pass me who will, slight me who will, I live henceforward only for the great duties of life : my business is on earth, my hope and my reward are in God."

He who takes the office of a Judge as it now exists in this country, takes in his hands a splendid gem, good and glorious, perfect and pure. Shall he give it up mutilated, shall he mar it, shall he darken it, shall it emit no light, shall it be valued at no price, shall it excite no wonder? Shall he find it a diamond, shall he leave it a stone? What shall we say to the man who would wilfully destroy with fire the magnificent temple of God, in which I am now preaching ? Far worse is he who ruins the moral edifices of the world, which time and toil, and many prayers to God, and many sufferings of men, have reared ; who puts out the light of the times in which he lives, and leaves us to wander amid the darkness of corruption and the desolation of sin. There may be, there probably is, in this church, some young man who may hereafter fill the office of an English Judge, when the greater part of those who hear me are dead, and mingled with the dust of the grave. Let him remember my words, and let them form and fashion his spirit : he cannot tell in what dangerous and awful times he may be placed ; but as a mariner looks to his compass in the calm, and looks to his compass in the storm, and never keeps his eyes off his compass, so in every vicissitude of a judicial life, deciding for the people, deciding against the people, protecting the just rights of kings, or restraining their unlawful ambition, let him ever cling to that pure, exalted, and Christian independence, which towers over the little motives of life ; which no hope of favour can influence, which no effort of power can control.

A Christian Judge in a free country should respect, on every occasion, those popular institutions of Justice, which were intended for his control, and for our security ; to see humble men collected accidentally from the neighbourhood, treated with tenderness and courtesy by supreme magistrates of deep learning and practised understanding, from whose views they are perhaps at that moment differing, and whose directions they do not choose to follow ; to see at such times every dis-

position to warmth restrained, and every tendency to contemptuous feeling kept back ; to witness the submission of the great and wise, not when it is extorted by necessity, but when it is practised with willingness and grace, is a spectacle which is very grateful to Englishmen, which no other country sees, which, above all things, shows that a Judge has a pure, gentle, and Christian heart, and that he never wishes to smite contrary to the law.

May I add the great importance in a Judge of courtesy to all men, and that he should, on all occasions, abstain from unnecessary bitterness and asperity of speech? A Judge always speaks with impunity, and always speaks with effect. His words should be weighed, because they entail no evil upon himself, and much evil upon others. The language of passion, the language of sarcasm, the language of satire, is not, on such occasions, Christian language: it is not the language of a Judge. There is a propriety of rebuke and condemnation, the justice of which is felt even by him who suffers under it ; but when magistrates, under the mask of law, aim at the offender more than the offence, and are more studious of inflicting pain, than repressing error or crime, the office suffers as much as the Judge : the respect for Justice is lessened ; and the school of pure reason becomes the hated theatre of mischievous passion.

A Christian Judge who means to be just, must not fear to smite according to the law ; he must remember that he beareth not the sword in vain. Under his protection we live, under his protection we acquire, under his protection we enjoy. Without him, no man would defend his character, no man would preserve his substance : proper pride, just gains, valuable exertions, all depend upon his firm wisdom. If he shrink from the severe duties of his office, he saps the foundation of social life, betrays the highest interests of the world, and sits not to judge according to the law.

The topics of mercy are the smallness of the offence—the infrequency of the offence. The temptations to the culprit, the moral weakness of the culprit, the severity of the law, the error of the law, the different state of society, the altered state of feeling, and above all, the distressing doubt whether a human being in the lowest abyss of poverty and ignorance, has not done injustice to himself, and is not perishing away from the want of knowledge, the want of fortune, and the want of friends. All magistrates feel these things in the early exercise of their judicial power, but the Christian Judge always feels them, is always youthful, always tender when he is going to shed human blood : retires from the business of men, communes with his own heart, ponders on the work of death, and prays to that Saviour who redeemed him, that he may not shed the blood of man in vain.

These, then, are those faults which expose a man to the danger of smiting contrary to the law : a Judge must be clear from the spirit of party, independent of all favour, well inclined to the popular institutions of his country; firm in applying the rule, merciful in making the exception ; patient, guarded in his speech, gentle, and courteous to all. Add his learning, his labour, his experience, his probity, his practised and acute faculties, and this man is the light of the world, who adorns human life, and gives security to that life which he adorns.

Now see the consequence of that state of Justice which this character implies, and the explanation of all that deserved honour we confer on the preservation of such a character, and all the wise jealousy we feel at the slightest injury or deterioration it may experience.

The most obvious and important use of this perfect Justice is, that it makes nations safe : under common circumstances, the institutions of Justice seem to have little or no bearing upon the safety and security of a country, but in periods of real danger, when a nation surrounded by foreign enemies contends not for the boundaries of empire, but for the very being and existence of empire ; then it is that the advantages of just institutions are

discovered. Every man feels that he has a country, that he has something worth preserving, and worth contending for. Instances are remembered where the weak prevailed over the strong: one man recalls to mind when a just and upright judge protected him from unlawful violence, gave him back his vineyard, rebuked his oppressor, restored him to his rights, published, condemned and rectified the wrong. This is what is called country. Equal rights to unequal possessions, equal justice to the rich and poor: this is what men come out to fight for, and to defend. Such a country has no legal injuries to remember, no legal murders to revenge, no legal robbery to redress: it is strong in its justice: it is then that the use and object of all this assemblage of gentlemen and arrangement of Juries, and the deserved veneration in which we hold the character of English Judges, is understood in all its bearings, and in its fullest effects: men die for such things — they cannot be subdued by foreign force where such just practices prevail. The sword of ambition is shivered to pieces against such a bulwark. Nations fall where Judges are unjust, because there is nothing which the multitude think worth defending; but nations do not fall which are treated as we are treated, but they rise as we have risen, and they shine as we have shone, and die as we have died, too much used to Justice, and too much used to freedom, to care for that life which is not just and free. I call you all to witness if there be any exaggerated picture in this: the sword is just sheathed, the flag is just furled, the last sound of the trumpet has just died away. You all remember what a spectacle this country exhibited: one heart, one voice — one weapon, one purpose. And why? Because this country is a country of the law; because the Judge is a judge for the peasant as well as for the palace; because every man's happiness is guarded by fixed rules from tyranny and caprice. This town, this week, the business of the few next days, would explain to any enlightened European why other nations *did* fall in the storms of the world, and why we did *not* fall. The Christian patience you may witness, the impartiality of the judgment-seat, the disrespect of persons, the disregard of consequences. These attributes of Justice do not end with arranging your conflicting rights, and mine; they give strength to the English people; duration to the English name; they turn the animal courage of this people into moral and religious courage, and present to the lowest of mankind plain reasons, and strong motives why they should resist aggression from without, and bind themselves a living rampart round the land of their birth.

There is another reason why every wise man is so scrupulously jealous of the character of English Justice. It puts an end to civil dissension. What other countries obtain by bloody wars, is here obtained by the decisions of our own tribunals; unchristian passions are laid to rest by these tribunals; brothers are brothers again; the Gospel resumes its empire, and because all confide in the presiding magistrate, and because a few plain men are allowed to decide upon their own conscientious impression of facts, civil discord, years of convulsion, endless crimes, are spared; the storm is laid, and those who came in clamouring for revenge, go back together in peace from the hall of judgment to the loom and the plough, to the senate and the church.

The whole tone and tenour of public morals is affected by the state of supreme Justice; it extinguishes revenge, it communicates a spirit of purity and uprightness to inferior magistrates; it makes the great good, by taking away impunity; it banishes fraud, obliquity, and solicitation, and teaches men that the law is their right. Truth is its handmaid, freedom is its child, peace is its companion; safety walks in its steps, victory follows in its train: it is the brightest emanation of the Gospel, it is the greatest attribute of God; it is that centre round which human motives and passions turn: and Justice, sitting on high, sees Genius and Power, and Wealth and Birth, revolving round her throne; and teaches their paths and

marks out their orbits, and warns with a loud voice, and rules with a strong arm, and carries order and discipline into a world, which but for her would only be a wild waste of passions. Look what we are, and what just laws have done for us : — a land of piety and charity ; — a land of churches, and hospitals, and altars ; — a nation of good Samaritans ; — a people of universal compassion. All lands, all seas, have heard we are brave. We have just sheathed that sword which defended the world ; we have just laid down that buckler which covered the nations of the earth. God blesses the soil with fertility ; English looms labour for every climate. All the waters of the globe are covered with English ships. We are softened by fine arts, civilised by human literature, instructed by deep science ; and every people, as they break their feudal chains, look to the founders and fathers of freedom for examples which may animate, and rules which may guide. If ever a nation was happy, if ever a nation was visibly blessed by God — if ever a nation was honoured abroad, and left at home under a government (which we can now conscientiously call a liberal government) to the full career of talent, industry, and vigour, we are at this moment that people — and this is our happy lot. — First the Gospel has done it, and then Justice has done it ; and he who thinks it his duty to labour that this happy condition of existence may remain, must guard the piety of these times, and he must watch over the spirit of Justice which exists in these times. First, he must take care that the altars of God are not polluted, that the Christian faith is retained in purity and in perfection : and then turning to human affairs, let him strive for spotless, incorruptible Justice ; — praising, honouring, and loving the just Judge, and abhorring, as the worst enemy of mankind, him who is placed there to "judge after the law, and who smites contrary to the law."

THE LAWYER THAT TEMPTED CHRIST.

A SERMON

PREACHED IN THE CATHEDRAL CHURCH OF ST. PETER, YORK

BEFORE

THE HON. SIR JOHN BAYLEY, KNT.

ONE OF HIS MAJESTY'S JUSTICES OF THE COURT OF KING'S BENCH

AND

THE HON. SIR JOHN HULLOCK, KNT.

ONE OF HIS MAJESTY'S BARONS OF THE COURT OF EXCHEQUER

AUGUST 1, 1824.

LUKE, X. 25.

And, behold, a certain lawyer stood up, and tempted Him, saying, "Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?"

THIS lawyer, who is thus represented to have tempted our blessed Saviour, does not seem to have been very much in earnest in the question which he asked: his object does not appear to have been the acquisition of religious knowledge, but the display of human talent. He did not say to himself, I will now draw near to this august Being; I will inform myself from the fountain of truth, and from the very lips of Christ, I will learn a lesson of salvation; but it occurred to him, that in such a gathering together of the Jews, in such a moment of public agitation, the opportunity of display was not to be neglected; full of that internal confidence which men of talents so ready, and so exercised, are sometimes apt to feel, he approaches our Saviour with all the apparent modesty of interrogation, and saluting him with the appellation of Master, prepares, with all professional acuteness, for his humiliation and defeat.

Talking humanly, and we must talk humanly, for our Saviour was then acting a human part, the experiment ended, as all must wish an experiment to end, where levity and bad faith are on one side, and piety, simplicity, and goodness on the other: the objector was silenced, and one of the brightest lessons of the Gospel elicited, for the eternal improvement of mankind.

Still, though we wish the motive for the question had been better, we must not forget the question, and we must not forget who asked the question, and we must not forget who answered it, and what that answer was. The question was the wisest and best that ever came from the mouth of man; the man who asked it was the very person who ought to have asked it; a man overwhelmed, probably, with the intrigues, the bustle, and business of life, and therefore, most likely to forget the interests of another world: the answerer was our blessed Saviour,

through whose mediation, you, and I, and all of us, hope to live again; and the answer, remember, was plain and practical; not flowery, not metaphysical, not doctrinal; but it said to the man of the law, If you wish to live eternally, do your duty to God and man; live in this world as you ought to live; make yourself fit for eternity; and then, and then only, God will grant to you eternal life.

There are, probably, in this church, many persons of the profession of the law, who have often asked before, with better faith than their brother, and who do now ask this great question, "What shall I do to inherit eternal life?" I shall, therefore, direct to them some observations on the particular duties they owe to society, because I think it suitable to this particular season, because it is of much more importance to tell men how they are to be Christians in detail, than to exhort them to be Christians generally; because it is of the highest utility to avail ourselves of these occasions, to show to classes of mankind what those virtues are, which they have more frequent and valuable opportunities of practising, and what those faults and vices are, to which they are more particularly exposed.

It falls to the lot of those who are engaged in the active and arduous profession of the law to pass their lives in great cities, amidst severe and incessant occupation, requiring all the faculties, and calling forth, from time to time, many of the strongest passions of our nature. In the midst of all this, rivals are to be watched, superiors are to be cultivated, connections cherished; some portion of life must be given to society, and some little to relaxation and amusement. When, then, is the question to be asked, "What shall I do to inherit eternal life?" what leisure for the altar, what time for God? I appeal to the experience of men engaged in this profession, whether religious feelings and religious practices are not, without any speculative disbelief, perpetually sacrificed to the business of the world? Are not the habits of devotion gradually displaced by other habits of solicitude, hurry, and care, totally incompatible with habits of devotion? Is not the taste for devotion lessened? Is not the time for devotion abridged? Are you not more and more conquered against your warnings and against your will; not, perhaps, without pain and compunction, by the Mammon of life? And what is the cure for this great evil to which your profession exposes you? The cure is, to keep a sacred place in your heart, where Almighty God is enshrined, and where nothing human can enter; to say to the world, "Thus far shalt thou go, and no further;" to remember you are a lawyer, without forgetting you are a Christian; to wish for no more wealth than ought to be possessed by an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven; to covet no more honour than is suitable to a child of God; boldly and bravely to set yourself limits, and to show to others you have limits, and that no professional eagerness, and no professional activity, shall ever induce you to infringe upon the rules and practices of religion: remember the text; put the great question really, which the tempter of Christ only pretended to put. In the midst of your highest success, in the most perfect gratification of your vanity, in the most ample increase of your wealth, fall down at the feet of Jesus, and say, "Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?"

The genuine and unaffected piety of a lawyer is, in one respect, of great advantage to the general interests of religion; inasmuch as to the highest member of that profession a great share of the Church patronage is entrusted, and to him we are accustomed to look up in the senate for the defence of our venerable Establishment; and great and momentous would be the loss to this nation, if any one, called to so high and honourable an office, were found deficient in this ancient, pious, and useful zeal for the Established Church. In talking to men of your active lives and habits, it is not possible to anticipate the splendid and exalted stations for which any one of you may be destined. Fifty years

ago, the person at the head of his profession, the greatest lawyer now in England, perhaps in the world, stood in this church, on such occasions as the present, as obscure, as unknown, and as much doubting of his future prospects as the humblest individual of the profession here present. If providence reserve such honours for any one who may now chance to hear me, let him remember that there is required at his hands a zeal for the Established Church, but a zeal tempered by discretion, compatible with Christian charity, and tolerant of Christian freedom. All human establishments are liable to err, and are capable of improvement: to act as if you denied this, to perpetuate any infringement upon the freedom of other sects, however vexatious that infringement, and however safe its removal, is not to defend an establishment, but to expose it to unmerited obloquy and reproach. Never think it necessary to be weak and childish in the highest concerns of life: the career of the law opens to you many great and glorious opportunities of promoting the Gospel of Christ, and of doing good to your fellow-creatures: there is no situation of that profession in which you can be more great and more glorious than when in the fulness of years, and the fulness of honours, you are found defending that Church which first taught you to distinguish between good and evil, and breathed into you the elements of religious life: but when you defend that Church, defend it with enlarged wisdom and with the spirit of magnanimity; praise its great excellences, do not perpetuate its little defects, be its liberal defender, be its wise patron, be its real friend. If you can be great and bold in human affairs, do not think it necessary to be narrow and timid in spiritual concerns: bind yourself up with the real and important interests of the Church, and hold yourself accountable to God for its safety; but yield up trifles to the altered state of the world. Fear no change which lessens the enemies of that Establishment, fear no change which increases the activity of that Establishment, fear no change which draws down upon it the more abundant prayers and blessings of the human race.

Justice is found, experimentally, to be most effectually promoted by the opposite efforts of practised and ingenious men presenting to the selection of an impartial judge the best arguments for the establishment and explanation of truth. It becomes, then, under such an arrangement, the decided duty of an advocate to use all the arguments in his power to defend the cause he has adopted, and to leave the effects of those arguments to the judgment of others. However useful this practice may be for the promotion of public justice, it is not without danger to the individual whose practice it becomes. It is apt to produce a profligate indifference to truth in higher occasions of life, where truth cannot for a moment be trifled with, much less callously trampled on, much less suddenly and totally yielded up to the basest of human motives. It is astonishing what unworthy and inadequate notions men are apt to form of the Christian faith. Christianity does not insist upon duties to an individual, and forget the duties which are owing to the great mass of individuals, which we call our country; it does not teach you how to benefit your neighbour, and leave you to inflict the most serious injuries upon all whose interest is bound up with you in the same land. I need not say to this congregation that there is a wrong and a right in public affairs, as there is a wrong and a right in private affairs. I need not prove that in any vote, in any line of conduct which affects the public interest, every Christian is bound most solemnly and most religiously, to follow the dictates of his conscience. Let it be for, let it be against, let it please, let it displease, no matter with whom it sides, or what it thwarts, it is a solemn duty, on such occasions, to act from the pure dictates of conscience, and to be as faithful to the interests of the great mass of your fellow-creatures, as you would be to the interests of any individual of that mass. Why, then,

if there be any truth in these observations, can that man be pure and innocent before God, can he be quite harmless and respectable before men, who, in mature age, at a moment's notice, sacrifices to wealth and power all the fixed and firm opinions of his life; who puts his moral principles to sale, and barters his dignity and his soul for the baubles of the world? If these temptations come across you, then remember the memorable words of the text, "What shall I do to inherit eternal life?" not this—don't do this: it is no title to eternity to suffer deserved shame among men: endure anything rather than the loss of character; cling to character as your best possession; do not envy men who pass you in life, only because they are under less moral and religious restraint than yourself. Your object is not fame, but honourable fame: your object is not wealth, but wealth worthily obtained: your object is not power, but power gained fairly, and exercised virtuously. Long-suffering is a great and important lesson in human life; in no part of human life is it more necessary than in your arduous profession. The greatest men it has produced have been at some period of their professional lives ready to faint at the long, and apparently fruitless journey; and if you look at those lives, you will find they have been supported by a confidence (under God) in the general effects of character and industry. They have withstood the allurement of pleasure, which is the first and most common cause of failure; they have disdained the little arts and meannesses which carry base men a certain way, and no further; they have sternly rejected also the sudden means of growing basely rich, and dishonourably great, with which every man is at one time or another sure to be assailed; and then they have broken out into light and glory at the last, exhibiting to mankind the splendid spectacle of great talents long exercised by difficulties, and high principles never tainted with guilt.

After all, remember that your profession is a lottery in which you may lose as well as win; and you must take it as a lottery, in which, after every effort of your own, it is impossible to command success: for this you are not accountable; but you are accountable for your purity; you are accountable for the preservation of your character. It is not in every man's power to say, I will be a great and successful lawyer; but it is in every man's power to say, that he will (with God's assistance) be a good Christian and an honest man. Whatever is moral and religious is in your own power. If fortune deserts you, do not desert yourself; do not undervalue inward consolation; connect God with your labour; remember you are Christ's servant; be seeking always for the inheritance of immortal life.

I must urge you by another motive, and bind you by another obligation, against the sacrifice of public principle. A proud man when he has obtained the reward, and accepted the wages of baseness, enters into a severe account with himself, and feels clearly that he has suffered degradation: he may hide it by increased zeal and violence, or varnish it over by simulated gaiety; he may silence the world, but he cannot always silence himself. If this is only a beginning, and you mean, henceforward, to trample all principle under foot, that is another thing; but a man of fine parts and nice feelings is trying a very dangerous experiment with his happiness, who means to preserve his general character, and indulge in one act of baseness. Such a man is not made to endure scorn and self-reproach: it is far from being certain that he will be satisfied with that unscriptural bargain in which he has gained the honours of the world, and lost the purity of his soul.

It is impossible in the profession of the law but that many opportunities must occur for the exertions of charity and benevolence: I do not mean the charity of money, but the charity of time, labour, and attention; the protection of those whose resources are feeble, and the information of those whose knowledge is small. In the hands of bad men, the law is sometimes an artifice to mislead, and sometimes

an engine to oppress. In your hands it may be, from time to time, a buckler to shield, and a sanctuary to save: you may lift up oppressed humility, listen patiently to the injuries of the wretched, vindicate their just claims, maintain their fair rights, and show, that in the hurry of business, and the struggles of ambition, you have not forgotten the duties of a Christian — and the feelings of a man. It is in your power, above all other Christians, to combine the wisdom of the serpent with the innocence of the dove, and to fulfil with greater energy and greater acuteness, and more perfect effect, than other men can pretend to, the love, the lessons, and the law of Christ.

I should caution the younger part of this profession (who are commonly selected for it on account of their superior talents,) to cultivate a little more diffidence of their own powers, and a little less contempt for received opinions, than is commonly exhibited at the beginning of their career: mistrust of this nature teaches moderation in the formation of opinions, and prevents the painful necessity of inconsistency and recantation in future life. It is not possible that the ablest young men at the beginning of their intellectual existence can anticipate all those reasons, and dive into all those motives, which induce mankind to act as they do act, and make the world such as we find it to be; and though there is doubtless much to alter, and much to improve in human affairs, yet you will find mankind not quite so wrong as, in the first ardour of youth, you supposed them to be; and you will find, as you advance in life, many new lights to open upon you, which nothing but advancing in life could ever enable you to observe. I say this, not to check originality and vigour of mind, which are the best chattels and possessions of the world; but to check that eagerness which arrives at conclusions without sufficient premises; to prevent that violence which is not uncommonly atoned for in after life, by the sacrifice of all principle and all opinions; to lessen that contempt which prevents a young man from improving his own understanding, by making a proper and prudent use of the understandings of his fellow-creatures.

There is another unchristian fault which must be guarded against in the profession of the law, and that is, misanthropy — an exaggerated opinion of the faults and follies of mankind. It is naturally the worst part of mankind who are seen in courts of justice, and with whom the professors of the law are most conversant. The perpetual recurrence of crime and guilt insensibly connects itself with the recollections of the human race: mankind are always painted in the attitude of suffering and inflicting. It seems as if men were bound together by the relations of fraud and crime; but laws are not made for the quiet, the good, and the just: you see and know little of them in your profession, and, therefore, you forget them: you see the oppressor, and you let loose your eloquence against him; but you do not see the man of silent charity, who is always seeking out objects of compassion: the faithful guardian does not come into a court of justice, nor the good wife, nor the just servant, nor the dutiful son; you punish the robbers who ill-treated the wayfaring man, but you know nothing of the good Samaritan who bound up his wounds. The lawyer who tempted his Master had heard, perhaps, of the sins of the woman at the feast, without knowing that she had poured her store of precious ointment on the feet of Jesus.

Upon those who are engaged in studying the laws of their country devolves the honourable and Christian task of defending the accused; a sacred duty never to be yielded up, never to be influenced by any vehemence, nor intensity of public opinion. In these times of profound peace and unexampled prosperity, there is little danger in executing this duty, and little temptation to violate it: but human affairs change like the clouds of heaven; another year may find us, or may leave us, in all the perils and bitterness of internal dissension; and

upon one of you may devolve the defence of some accused person, the object of men's hopes and fears, the single point on which the eyes of a whole people are bent. These are the occasions which try a man's inward heart, and separate the dross of human nature from the gold of human nature. On these occasions, never mind being mixed up for a moment with the criminal, and the crime; fling yourself back upon great principles, fling yourself back upon God; yield not one atom to violence; suffer not the slightest encroachments of injustice; retire not one step before the frowns of power; tremble not, for a single instant, at the dread of misrepresentation. The great interests of mankind are placed in your hands; it is not so much the individual you are defending; it is not so much a matter of consequence whether this, or that, is proved to be a crime; but on such occasion, you are often called upon to defend the occupation of a defender, to take care that the sacred rights belonging to that character are not destroyed; that that best privilege of your profession, which so much secures our regard, and so much redounds to your credit, is never soothed by flattery, never corrupted by favour, never chilled by fear. You may practise this wickedness secretly, as you may any other wickedness; you may suppress a topic of defence, or soften an attack upon opponents, or weaken your own argument, and sacrifice the man who has put his trust in you, rather than provoke the powerful by the triumphant establishment of unwelcome innocence: but if you do this, you are a guilty man before God. It is better to keep within the pale of honour, it is better to be pure in Christ, and to feel that you are pure in Christ: and if ever the praises of mankind are sweet, if it be ever allowable to a Christian to breathe the incense of popular favour, and to say it is grateful and good, it is when the honest, temperate, unyielding advocate, who has protected innocence from the grasp of power, is followed from the hall of judgment by the prayers and blessings of a grateful people.

These are the Christian excellences which the members of the profession of the law have, above all, an opportunity of cultivating: this is your tribute to the happiness of your fellow-creatures, and these your preparations for eternal life. Do not lose God in the fervour and business of the world; remember that the churches of Christ are more solemn, and more sacred, than your tribunals; bend not before the judges of the king, and forget the Judge of judges; search not other men's hearts without heeding that your own hearts will be searched; be innocent in the midst of subtilty; do not carry the lawful arts of your profession beyond your profession; but when the robe of the advocate is laid aside, so live that no man shall dare to suppose your opinions venal, or that your talents and energy may be bought for a price: do not heap scorn and contempt upon your declining years, by precipitate ardour for success in your profession; but set out with a firm determination to be unknown, rather than ill known; and to rise honestly, if you rise at all. Let the world see that you have risen, because the natural probity of your heart leads you to truth; because the precision and extent of your legal knowledge enables you to find the right way of doing the right thing; because the thorough knowledge of legal art and legal form is, in your hands, not an instrument of chicanery, but the plainest, easiest, and shortest way to the end of strife. Impress upon yourself the importance of your profession; consider that some of the greatest and most important interests of the world are committed to your care — that you are our protectors against the encroachments of power — that you are the preservers of freedom, the defenders of weakness, the unravellers of cunning, the investigators of artifice, the humblers of pride, and the scourges of oppression: when you are silent, the sword leaps from its scabbard, and nations are given up to the madness of internal strife. In all

the civil difficulties of life, men depend upon your exercised faculties, and your spotless integrity; and they require of you an elevation above all that is mean, and a spirit which will never yield when it ought not to yield. As long as your profession retains its character for learning, the rights of mankind will be well arranged; as long as it retains its character for virtuous boldness, those rights will be well defended; as long as it preserves itself pure and incorruptible on other occasions not connected with your profession, those talents will never be used to the public injury, which were intended and nurtured for the public good. I hope you will weigh these observations, and apply them to the business of the ensuing week, and beyond that, in the common occupations of your profession: always bearing in your minds the emphatic words of the text, and often in the hurry of your busy, active lives, honestly, humbly, heartily exclaiming to the Son of God, "Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?"

SPEECHES.

MEETING OF THE CLERGY OF CLEVELAND.

March, 1825.

[From the *Yorkshire Herald.*]

Mr. Archdeacon, — I am extremely sorry that the clergy of the North Riding of Yorkshire have abandoned that distinction and pre-eminence, which they have held over the clergy of the other two Ridings, in their abstinence from political discussion and from public meetings, on the subject of the Catholics. I sincerely wish that nothing had been done, and no meeting of any description called. As it *has* been called, it is my duty to attend it, and certainly I will *not* attend in silence. Do not let my learned brethren, however, be alarmed; I am not going to inflict upon them a speech. I never attended a public political meeting before in my life; nor have I *ever* made a speech; and therefore my want of skill is a pretty good security to you for my want of length.

There are two difficulties in speaking upon the subject; — one, that the topics are very numerous, the other, that they are trite; — the last I cannot cure, nor can *you* cure it; and we must all agree to suffer patiently under each other. I shall obviate the first by confining myself to those commonplaces in which the strength of the enemy seems principally to consist: if they have been an hundred times refuted before, do not blame *me* for refuting them again, but take the blame to yourselves for advancing them!

The first dictum of the enemies of the Catholics is, *that they are not to be believed upon their oath*; but upon what condition did the parliament of 1793 grant to the Catholics immunity and relief? Upon the condition that *they should sign certain oaths*; and why was this made a condition, if the oath of a Catholic is not credible? Or is a small subdivision of the clergy of the North Riding of Yorkshire to consider that test as futile, and those securities as frail, which the united wisdom of the British Parliament has deemed sufficient for the most sacred acts, and the most solemn laws? I am almost *ashamed* to ask you (for it has been regularly asked in this discussion for thirty years past), by what are the Catholics excluded from the offices for which they petition, unless by their respect for oaths? If they do *not* respect oaths they cannot be excluded; if they *do* respect oaths, why do you exclude them when you have such means of safety and security in your own hands? If Catholics are so careless of their oaths, show me some suspected Catholic who has crept into place by perjury; who has enjoyed those advantages by his own impiety, which are denied to him by the justice of the law: I not only do not *know* an instance of this kind, but I never *heard of* such an instance: — if *you* have heard such an instance, produce it; if not, give up your gratuitous and

scandalous charge. But not only do I see men of the greatest rank and fortune submitting to the most mortifying privations for the sake of oaths, but I see the lowest and poorest Catholics give up their right of voting at elections, sacrificing the opportunity of supporting the favourer of their favourite question, and suffering the disgrace of rejection at the hustings, from their delicate and conscientious regard to the solemn covenant of an oath. What magistrate *dares* reject the oath of a Catholic? What *judge* dares reject it? Is not property changed, is not liberty abridged, is not the blood of the malefactor shed? Are not the most solemn acts of law, both here and in Ireland, founded and bottomed upon the oath of a Catholic? Is no peace, is no league, made with Catholics? do not the repose and happiness of Europe often rest upon the oaths and asseverations of Catholics? Does my learned brother forget that two-thirds of Christian Europe are Catholics?—and am I to understand from him, that this vast proportion of the Christian world is deficient in the common elements of civil life?—that they are no more capable of herding together than the brutes of the field?—that they appeal to God only to allay suspicion, and to protect fraud? If such are *his* opinions, I must tell him (though I am sure he neither knows the mischief, nor means it), that Carlile, in his wildest blasphemies against the Christian religion, never uttered anything against it so horrible and so unjust.

I come now to another common phrase, the parent of much bigotry and mischief; and that is, that "*The spirit of the Catholic religion is unchangeable and unchanged.*" Now, Sir, I must tell these gentlemen of the 15th century, that if this method of appealing to the absurdities of a past age, and impinging them upon the present age is fair and just, it must be a rule as applicable to one sect as to another. Upon this principle, I may call the Church of Scotland a persecuting Church, because, in the year 1646, it petitioned Parliament for the severest persecution of heretics. Upon the same principle, Catholics might retort upon our own Church the many Catholics condemned to death in the reign of Elizabeth;—upon this principle they might cast in your teeth the decrees of the University of Oxford, in support of passive obedience, ordered by the House of Commons to be burned by the hands of the common hangman in the reign of Queen Anne; they might remind you of the atrocious and immoral acts of Parliament, passed by the Protestant parliaments of Ireland against its Catholic inhabitants, during the reigns of George I. and George II. Wickedness and cruelty such as the Spartan would not have exercised upon his helot—such as the planter would abstain from with his slave—one of the *worst* and most *wicked* periods of human history! Are all these imputations true *now*, because they were true *then?* Has not the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland almost petitioned in favour of the Catholics? Would any Protestant church *now* condemn to death those who dissented from the doctrines of its establishment? All dissenters live in the midst of our venerable establishment unmolested, and under the broad canopy of the law. It is not *now* possible, with all the intelligence and wisdom which characterises that learned body, that a similar decree should emanate from the University of Oxford. For all our *own* institutions we claim the benefit of time; and, like Joshua, bid the sun stand still, when we want to smite and discomfit our enemies. But, Sir, remember at what a period this assertion is made—of the unchanged and unchangeable spirit of the Catholic religion. The Catholic revenues are destroyed, and yet the spirit of submission to priests is the same in the minds of the lay Catholics who have voted for the destruction of these revenues. The inquisitions are broken open—the chains of the victims are loosened—the fires are quenched—the Catholic churches are deserted! In Spain, in France, in Italy, the priests are reduced to a state of beggary; and yet the authors of this meeting can see

no change in the minds of the Catholics. Sir, I meet this absolute assertion with an absolute denial! and I bring my proofs. Let the mover of this resolution read the oath of 1793, taken by the four Catholic archbishops, the bishops and clergy of Ireland,—let him read the rescript of pope Pius VI., of the 17th of June, 1791,—let him read the solemn resolutions of six of the most considerable Catholic universities of Europe, required and received by Mr. Pitt,—let him remember that the pope has confirmed a Catholic bishop of Malta, nominated to that see by the late king; and now let the learned gentleman produce to me, from his records, such facts, such opinions, such clear declarations, such securities, and such liberality as these. He has nothing to produce, and nothing to say, but the *trita cantilena* that "the spirit of the Catholic religion is unchangeable and unchanged." Sir, if I could suffer my understanding to be debauched by such a mere jingle of words—if I could say that any human spirit was unchanged and unchangeable, I should say so of that miserable spirit of religious persecution, of that monastic meanness, of that monopoly of heaven, which says to other human beings, "If you will not hold up your hands in prayer as I hold mine—if you will not worship your God as I worship mine, I will blast you with civil incapacities, and keep you for ever in the dust." This, Sir, of all the demons which haunt the earth, is the last bad spirit which retires before justice, courage, and truth.

I must not pass over (while I am cleansing gutters and sweeping streets) the notable phrase of "*a government essentially Protestant.*" If this phrase mean anything, it means nothing useful to the arguments of my opponents. In clinging to this phrase, which, by the smiles and nods of the gentlemen opposite, appears to give them peculiar delight, they must mean, I suppose, Episcopalian as well as Protestant, for they never can mean that our government is essentially Presbyterian, essentially Swedenborgian, essentially Ranting, or essentially Methodist. With this limitation, I beg to ask why this essentially Protestant government allows Unitarians and Presbyterians in the bosom of its legislature? Why there is a regular Catholic establishment in Malta and in Canada? Why it tolerates (nay, even endows) Mahomedan and Hindoo establishments? In the midst of this "essentially Protestant government," sat Catholic peers and Catholic commoners for more than a century — without blame, without reproach, without religious conflict, in civil harmony, and in theological peace.

Now I come to the *danger!* What is it? Is it from foreign intercourse? But is the question now agitated for the first time, whether or not the priests of Ireland are to have intercourse with a foreign power? That intercourse has subsisted for centuries, does subsist at this moment, in full vigour, uninspected and uncontrolled. Mr. Grattan's bill, which I strongly suspect the learned mover never to have read, subjects all this intercourse to the inspection of Protestant commissioners, punishes, not with obsolete penalties like the present laws, but with adequate and proper punishment, any clandestine intercourse with Rome. I really *did* expect that my learned brothers would be able to discriminate the remedy from the disease, and that when they had resolved to be frightened, they would at least have ascribed their agitation to the unrestrained intercourse with Rome; and not to the very measures which are intended to prevent it. Does the learned mover imagine that the Protestants, like children, are going to lay open all offices to the Catholics without exception and without precaution? No Catholic chancellor, no Lord-keeper, no Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, no place in any ecclesiastical court of judicature; and many other restraints and negatives are contained in the intended emancipation of the Catholics. Then let the learned gentleman read the proposed oath. I defy Dr. Duigenan, in the full vigour of his incapacity, in the strongest access of that Protestant epilepsy with which he was so often convulsed, to have added

a single security to the security of that oath. If Catholics are formidable, are not Protestant members elected *by* Catholics formidable? But what will the numbers of the Catholics be? Five or six in one house, and ten or twelve in the other; and this I state upon the printed authority of Lord Harrowby, the tried and acknowledged friend of our Church, the amiable and revered patron of its poorest members. The Catholics did not rebel during the war carried on for a Catholic king in the year 1715, nor in 1745. The government armed the Catholics in the American war. The last rebellion no one pretends to have been a Catholic rebellion, the leaders were, with one exception, all Protestants. The king of Prussia, the emperor of Russia, do not complain of their Catholic subjects. The Swiss cantons, Catholic and Protestant, live together in harmony and peace. Childish prophecies of danger are always made, and always falsified. The Church of England (if you will believe some of its members) is the most fainting, sickly, hysterical institution that ever existed in the world. Everything is to destroy it, everything to work its dissolution and decay. If money is taken for tithes, the Church of England is to perish. If six old Catholic peers, and twelve commoners, come into Parliament, these holy hypochondriacs tear their hair, and beat their breast, and mourn over the ruin of their Established Church! The Ranter of yesterday is cheerful and confident. The Presbyterian stands upon his principles. The Quaker is calm and contented. The strongest, and wisest, and best establishment in the world, suffers in the full vigour of manhood all the fears and the tremblings of extreme old age.

A vast deal is said of the spirit of the Church of Rome, and of the claims it continues to make. But what signify its claims, and of what importance is its spirit? The bill will refuse all office to Catholics, who will not, by the most solemn oath, restrain this spirit, and abjure their claims. What establishment can muzzle its fools and lunatics? No one who will not abjure these Catholic follies can take anything by Catholic emancipation. The bill which emancipates, is not a bill to emancipate all Catholics; but only to emancipate those who will prove to us, by the most solemn obligations, that they are wise and moderate Catholics.

I conclude, Sir, remarks which, upon such a subject, might be carried to almost any extent, with presenting to you a petition to Parliament, and recommending it for the adoption of this meeting. And upon this petition, I beg leave to say a few words:—I am the writer of the petition I lay before you; and I have endeavoured to make it as mild and moderate as I possibly could. If I had consulted my own opinions *alone*, I should have said, that the disabling laws against the Catholics were a disgrace to the statute-book, and that every principle of justice, prudence, and humanity, called for their immediate repeal; but he who wishes to do anything useful in this world, must consult the opinions of others as well as his own. I knew very well if I had proposed such a petition to my excellent friends, the Archdeacon and Mr. William Vernon, it would not have suited the mildness and moderation of their character, that they should accede to it; and I knew very well, that without the authority of their names, I could have done nothing. The present petition, when proposed to them by me, met, as I expected, with their ready and cheerful compliance. But though I propose this petition as preferable to the other, I should infinitely prefer that we do nothing, and disperse without coming to any resolution.

I am sick of these little clerico-political meetings. They bring a disgrace upon us and upon our profession, and make us hateful in the eyes of the laity. The best thing we could have done, would have been never to have met at all. The next best thing we can do (now we are met), is to do nothing. The third choice is to take my petition. The fourth, last, and worst, to adopt your own. The wisest thing I have heard here to-day, is the proposition of Mr. Chaloner, that we should burn

both petitions, and ride home. Here we are, a set of obscure country clergymen, at the "Three Tuns," at Thirsk, like flies on the chariot-wheel; perched upon a question of which we can neither see the diameter, nor control the motion, nor influence the moving force. What good can such meetings do? They emanate from local conceit, advertise local ignorance; make men, who are venerable by their profession, ridiculous by their pretensions, and swell that mass of paper lumber, which, got up with infinite rural bustle, and read without being heard in Parliament, are speedily consigned to merited contempt.

A PETITION

Proposed by the Rev. Sydney Smith, at a Meeting of the Clergy of Cleveland, in Yorkshire, on the subject of the Catholic Question.—1825.

We, the undersigned, being clergymen of the Church of England, resident within the diocese of York, humbly petition your Honourable House to take into your consideration the state of those laws which affect the Roman Catholics of Great Britain and Ireland.

We beg you to inquire, whether all those statutes, however wise and necessary in their origin, may not *now* (when the Church of England is rooted in the public affection, and the title to the throne undisputed) be wisely and safely repealed.

We are steadfast friends to that Church of which we are members, and we wish no law repealed which is really essential to its safety; but we submit to the superior wisdom of your Honourable House, whether that Church is not sufficiently protected by its antiquity, by its learning, by its piety, and by that moderate tenor which it knows so well how to preserve amidst the opposite excesses of mankind—the indifference of one age, and the fanaticism of another.

It is our earnest hope, that any indulgence you might otherwise think it expedient to extend to the Catholic subjects of this realm, may not be prevented by the intemperate conduct of some few members of that persuasion; that in the great business of framing a lasting religious peace for these kingdoms, the extravagance of over-heated minds, or the studied insolence of men who intend mischief, may be equally overlooked.

If your Honourable House should, in your wisdom, determine that all these laws, which are enacted against the Roman Catholics, cannot with safety and advantage be repealed, we then venture to express an hope, that such disqualifying laws alone will be suffered to remain, which you consider to be clearly required for the good of the Church and State.

We feel the blessing of our own religious liberty, and we think it a serious duty to extend it to others, in every degree in which sound discretion will permit.

Note.—This meeting was very numerously attended by the clergy. Mr. Archdeacon Wrangham and the Reverend William Vernon Harcourt (son of the late Archbishop of York), a very enlightened and liberal man, were the only persons who supported the Petition.

CATHOLIC CLAIMS.

A Speech at a Meeting of the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of the East Riding of Yorkshire, held at Beverley, in that Riding, on Monday, April 11, 1825, *for the purpose of petitioning Parliament, &c.**

[From the *Yorkshire Herald.*]

Mr. Archdeacon,—It is very disagreeable to me to differ from so many worthy and respectable clergymen here assembled, and not only to differ from them, but, I am afraid, to stand alone among them. I would much rather vote in majorities, and join in this, or any other political chorus, than to stand unassisted and alone, as I am now doing. I dislike such meetings for

* I was left at this meeting in a minority of one. A poor clergyman whispered to me, that he was quite of my way of thinking, but had nine children. *I begged he would remain a Protestant.*

such purposes—I wish I could reconcile it to my conscience to stay away from them, and to my temperament to be silent at them; but if they are called by others, I deem it right to attend—if I attend, I must say what I think. If it be unwise in us to meet in taverns to discuss political subjects, the fault is not mine, for I should never think of calling such a meeting. If the subject is trite, no blame is imputable to me: it is as dull to me to handle such subjects, as it is to you to hear them. The customary promise on the threshold of an inn is good entertainment for man and horse.—If there be any truth in any part of this sentence at the Tiger, at Beverley, our horses at this moment must certainly be in a state of much greater enjoyment than the masters who rode them.

It will be some amusement, however, to this meeting, to observe the schism which this question has occasioned in my own parish of Londesborough. My excellent and respectable curate, Mr. Milestones, alarmed at the effect of the Pope upon the East Riding, has come here to oppose me, and there he stands, breathing war and vengeance on the Vatican. We had some previous conversation on this subject, and, in imitation of our superiors, we agreed not to make it a Cabinet question.—Mr. Milestones, indeed, with that delicacy and propriety which belongs to his character, expressed some scruples upon the propriety of voting against his rector, but I insisted he should come and vote against me. I assured him nothing would give me more pain than to think I had prevented, in any man, the free assertion of honest opinions. That such conduct, on his part, instead of causing jealousy and animosity between us, could not, and would not, fail to increase my regard and respect for him.

I beg leave, Sir, before I proceed on this subject, to state what I mean by Catholic emancipation. I mean eligibility of Catholics to all civil offices, with the usual exceptions introduced into all bills—jealous safeguards for the preservation of the Protestant Church, and for the regulation of the intercourse with Rome—and, lastly, provision for the Catholic clergy.

I object, Sir, to the law as it stands at present, because it is impolitic, and because it is unjust. It is impolitic, because it exposes this country to the greatest danger in time of war. Can you believe, Sir, can any man of the most ordinary turn for observation believe, that the monarchs of Europe mean to leave this country in the quiet possession of the high station which it at present holds? Is it not obvious that a war is coming on between the governments of law and the governments of despotism?—that the weak and tottering race of the Bourbons will (whatever our wishes may be) be compelled to gratify the wounded vanity of the French, by plunging them into a war with England. Already they are pitying the Irish people, as you pity the West Indian slaves—already they are opening colleges for the reception of Irish priests. Will they wait for your tardy wisdom and reluctant liberality? Is not the present state of Ireland a premium upon early invasion? Does it not hold out the most alluring invitation to your enemies to begin? And if the flag of any hostile power in Europe is unfurled in that unhappy country, is there one Irish peasant who will not hasten to join it?—and not only the peasantry, Sir; the peasantry begin these things, but the peasantry do not end them—they are soon joined by an order a little above them—and then, after a trifling success, a still superior class think it worth while to try the risk: men are hurried into a rebellion, as the oxen were pulled into the cave of Cacus, tail foremost. The mob first, who have nothing to lose but their lives, of which every Irishman has nine—then comes the shopkeeper—then the parish priest—then the vicar-general—then Dr. Doyle, and, lastly, Daniel O'Connell. But if the French were to make the same blunders respecting Ireland as Napoleon committed, if wind and weather preserved Ireland for you a second time, still all your resources would be crippled by watching Ireland. The force employed for this might liberate

Spain and Portugal, protect India, or accomplish any great purpose of offence or defence.

War, Sir, seems to be almost as natural a state to mankind as peace; but if you could hope to escape war, is there a more powerful receipt for destroying the prosperity of any country than these eternal jealousies and distinctions between the two religions? What man will carry his industry and his capital into a country where his yard measure is a sword, his pounce-box a powder-flask, and his ledger a return of killed and wounded? Where a cat will get, there I know a cotton-spinner will penetrate; but let these gentlemen wait till a few of their factories have been burnt down, till one or two respectable merchants of Manchester have been carded, and till they have seen the Cravatists hanging the Shanavists in cotton twist. In the present fervour for spinning, ourang-outangs, Sir, would be employed to spin, if they could be found in sufficient quantities; but miserably will those reasoners be disappointed who repose upon cotton — not upon justice —and who imagine this great question can be put aside, because a few hundred Irish spinners are gaining a morsel of bread by the overflowing industry of the English market.

But what right have you to continue these rules, Sir, these laws of exclusion? What necessity can you show for it? Is the reigning monarch a concealed Catholic? — Is his successor an open one? — Is there a disputed succession? — Is there a Catholic pretender? If some of these circumstances are said to have justified the introduction, and others the continuation, of these measures, why does not the disappearance of all these circumstances justify the repeal of the restrictions? If you must be unjust—if it is a luxury you cannot live without — reserve your injustice for the weak, and not for the strong— persecute the Unitarians, muzzle the Ranters, be unjust to a few thousand sectaries, not to six millions—galvanise a frog, don't galvanise a tiger.

If you go into a parsonage-house in the country, Mr. Archdeacon, you see sometimes a style and fashion of furniture which does very well for us, but which has had its day in London. It is seen in London no more; it is banished to the provinces; from the gentleman's houses of the provinces these pieces of furniture, as soon as they are discovered to be unfashionable, descend to the farm-houses, then to cottages, then to the faggot-heap, then to the dung-hill. As it is with furniture so it is with arguments. I hear at country meetings many arguments against the Catholics which are never heard in London: their London existence is over — they are only to be met with in the provinces, and there they are fast hastening down, with clumsy chairs and ill-fashioned sofas, to another order of men. But, Sir, as they are not yet gone where I am sure they are going, I shall endeavour to point out their defects, and to accelerate their descent.

Many gentlemen now assembled at the Tiger Inn, at Beverley, believe that the Catholics do not keep faith with heretics; these gentlemen ought to know that Mr. Pitt put this very question to six of the leading Catholic Universities in Europe. He inquired of them whether this tenet did or did not constitute any part of the Catholic faith. The question received from these Universities the most decided negative; they denied that such doctrine formed any part of the creed of Catholics. Such doctrine, Sir, is denied upon oath, in the bill now pending in Parliament, a copy of which I hold in my hand. The denial of such a doctrine upon oath is the only means by which a Catholic can relieve himself from his present incapacities. If a Catholic, therefore, Sir, will not take the oath, he is not relieved, and remains where you wish him to remain; if he do take the oath, you are safe from this peril; if he have no scruple about oaths, of what consequence is it whether this bill passes, the very object of which is to relieve him from oaths? Look at the fact, Sir. Do the Protestant cantons of Switzerland, living under the same state with the Catholic cantons, complain that no

faith is kept with heretics? Do not the Catholics and Protestants in the kingdom of the Netherlands meet in one common Parliament? Could they pursue a common purpose, have common friends, and common enemies, if there were a shadow of truth in this doctrine imputed to the Catholics? The religious affairs of this last kingdom are managed with the strictest impartiality to both sects; ten Catholics and ten Protestants (gentlemen need not look so much surprised to hear it) positively meet together, Sir, in the same room. They constitute what is called the religious committee for the kingdom of the Netherlands, and so extremely desirous are they of preserving the strictest impartiality, that they have chosen a Jew for their secretary. Their conduct has been unimpeachable and unimpeached; the two sects are at peace with each other; and the doctrine, that no faith is kept with heretics, would, I assure you, be very little credited at Amsterdam or the Hague, cities as essentially Protestant as the town of Beverley.

Wretched is our condition, and still more wretched the condition of Ireland, if the Catholic does not respect his oath. He serves on grand and petty juries in both countries; we trust our lives, our liberties, and our properties, to his conscientious reverence of an oath, and yet, when it suits the purposes of party to bring forth this argument, we say he has no respect for oaths. The right to a landed estate of 3000*l.* per annum was decided last week, in York, by a jury, the foreman of which was a Catholic; does any human being harbour a thought, that this gentleman, whom we all know and respect, would, under any circumstances, have thought more lightly of the obligation of an oath than his Protestant brethren of the box? We all disbelieve these arguments of Mr. A. the Catholic, and of Mr. B. the Catholic; but we believe them of Catholics in general, of the abstract Catholics, of the Catholic of the Tiger Inn, at Beverley, the formidable unknown Catholic, that is so apt to haunt our clerical meetings.

I observe that some gentlemen who argue this question are very bold about other offices, but very jealous lest Catholic gentlemen should become justices of the peace. If this jealousy be justifiable anywhere, it is justifiable in Ireland, where some of the best and most respectable magistrates are Catholics.

It is not true that the Roman Catholic religion is what it was. I meet that assertion with a plump denial. The Pope does not dethrone kings, nor give away kingdoms, does not extort money, has given up, in some instances, the nomination of bishops to Catholic Princes, in some I believe to Protestant Princes: Protestant worship is now carried on at Rome. In the Low Countries, the seat of the Duke of Alva's cruelties, the Catholic tolerates the Protestant, and sits with him in the same Parliament — the same in Hungary — the same in France. The first use which even the Spanish people made of their ephemeral liberty was to destroy the Inquisition. It was destroyed also by the mob of Portugal. I am so far from thinking the Catholic not to be more tolerant than he was, that I am much afraid the English, who gave the first lesson of toleration to mankind, will very soon have a great deal to learn from their pupils.

Some men quarrel with the Catholics, because their language was violent in the Association; but a groan or two, Sir, after two hundred years of incessant tyranny, may surely be forgiven. A few warm phrases to compensate the legal massacre of a million of Irishmen are not unworthy of our pardon. All this hardly deserves the eternal incapacity of holding civil offices. Then they quarrel with the Bible Society; in other words, they vindicate that ancient tenet of their Church, that the Scriptures are not to be left to the unguided judgment of the laity. The objection to Catholics is, that they did what Catholics ought to do — and do not many prelates of our Church object to the Bible Society, and contend that the Scriptures ought not to be circulated without the comment of the Prayer Book and the Articles? If they are right, the Catho-

lics are not wrong; and if the Catholics are wrong, they are in such good company, that we ought to respect their errors.

Why not pay their clergy? the Presbyterian clergy in the north of Ireland are paid by the state: the Catholic clergy of Canada are provided for: the priests of the Hindoos are, I believe, in some of their temples, paid by the Company. You must surely admit, that the Catholic religion (the religion of two thirds of Europe) is better than no religion. I do not regret that the Irish are under the dominion of the priests. I am glad that so savage a people as the lower orders of Irish *are* under the dominion of their priests; for it is a step gained to place such beings under any influence, and the clergy are always the first civilisers of mankind. The Irish are deserted by their natural aristocracy, and I should wish to make their priesthood respectable in their appearance, and easy in their circumstances. A government provision has produced the most important changes in the opinions of the Presbyterian clergy of the north of Ireland, and has changed them from levellers and Jacobins into reasonable men; it would not fail to improve most materially the political opinions of the Catholic priests. This cannot, however, be done, without the emancipation of the laity. No priest would dare to accept a salary from Government, unless this preliminary were settled. I am aware it would give to Government a tremendous power in that country; but I must choose the least of two evils. The great point, as the physicians say, in some diseases, is to resist the tendency to death. The great object of our day is to prevent the loss of Ireland, and the consequent ruin of England; to obviate the tendency to death; we will first keep the patient alive, and then dispute about his diet and his medicine.

Suppose a law were passed, that no clergyman, who had ever held a living in the East Riding, could be made a bishop. Many gentlemen here (who have no hopes of ever being removed from their parishes) would feel the restriction of the law as a considerable degradation. We should soon be pointed at as a lower order of clergymen. It would not be long before the common people would find some fortunate epithet for us, and it would not be long either before we should observe in our brethren of the north and the west an air of superiority, which would aggravate not a little the injustice of the privation. Every man feels the insults thrown upon his *caste*; the insulted party falls lower, everybody else becomes higher. There are heart-burnings and recollections. Peace flies from that land. The volume of Parliamentary evidence I have brought here is loaded with the testimony of witnesses of all ranks and occupations, stating to the House of Commons the undoubted effects produced upon the lower order of Catholics by these disqualifying laws, and the lively interest they take in their removal. I have seventeen quotations, Sir, from this evidence, and am ready to give any gentleman my references; but I forbear to read them, from compassion to my reverend brethren, who have trotted many miles to vote against the Pope, and who will trot back in the dark, if I attempt to throw additional light upon the subject.

I have, also, Sir, a high-spirited class of gentlemen to deal with, who will do nothing from fear, who admit the danger, but think it disgraceful to act as if they feared it. There is a degree of fear, which destroys a man's faculties, renders him incapable of acting, and makes him ridiculous. There is another sort of fear, which enables a man to foresee a coming evil, to measure it, to examine his powers of resistance, to balance the evil of submission against the evils of opposition or defeat, and if he thinks he must be ultimately overpowered, leads him to find a good escape in a good time. I can see no possible disgrace in feeling this sort of fear, and in listening to its suggestions. But it is mere cant to say, that men will not be actuated by fear in such questions as these. Those who pretend not to

fear now, would be the first to fear upon the approach of danger; it is always the case with this distant valour. Most of the concessions which have been given to the Irish have been given to fear. Ireland would have been lost to this country, if the British Legislature had not, with all the rapidity and precipitation of the truest panic, passed those acts which Ireland did not ask, but demanded in the time of her armed associations. I should not think a man brave, but mad, who did not fear the treasons and rebellions of Ireland in time of war. I should think him not dastardly, but consummately wise, who provided against them in time of peace. The Catholic question has made a greater progress since the opening of this Parliament than I ever remember it to have made, and it has made that progress from fear alone. The House of Commons were astonished by the union of the Irish Catholics. They saw that Catholic Ireland had discovered her strength, and stretched out her limbs, and felt manly powers, and called for manly treatment; and the House of Commons wisely and practically yielded to the innovations of time, and the shifting attitude of human affairs.

I admit the Church, Sir, to be in great danger. I am sure the State is so also. My remedy for these evils is, to enter into an alliance with the Irish people — to conciliate the clergy, by giving them pensions — to loyalise the laity, by putting them on a footing with the Protestant. My remedy is the old one, approved of from the beginning of the world, to lessen dangers, by increasing friends, and appeasing enemies. I think it most probable that under this system of Crown patronage the clergy will be quiet. A Catholic layman, who finds all the honours of the state open to him, will not, I think, run into treason and rebellion — will not live with a rope about his neck, in order to turn our bishops out, and put his own in; he may not, too, be of opinion that the utility of his bishop will be four times as great, because his income is four times as large; but whether he is or not, he will never endanger his sweet acres (large measure) for such questions as these. Anti-Trinitarian Dissenters sit in the House of Commons, whom we believe to be condemned to the punishments of another world. There is no limit to the introduction of Dissenters into both Houses — Dissenting Lords or Dissenting Commons. What mischief have Dissenters for this last century and a half plotted against the Church of England? The Catholic lord and the Catholic gentleman (restored to their fair rights) will never join with levellers and Iconoclasts. You will find them defending you hereafter against your Protestant enemies. The crosier in any hand, the mitre on any head, are more tolerable in the eyes of a Catholic than doxological Barebones and tonsured Cromwell.

We preach to our congregations, Sir, that a tree is known by its fruits. By the fruits it produces I will judge your system. What has it done for Ireland? New Zealand is emerging — Otaheite is emerging — Ireland is not emerging — she is still veiled in darkness — her children, safe under no law, live in the very shadow of death. Has your system of exclusion made Ireland rich? Has it made Ireland loyal? Has it made Ireland free? Has it made Ireland happy? How is the wealth of Ireland proved? Is it by the naked, idle, suffering savages, who are slumbering on the mud floor of their cabins? In what does the loyalty of Ireland consist? Is it in the eagerness with which they would range themselves under the hostile banner of any invader, for your destruction and for your distress? Is it liberty when men breathe and move among the bayonets of English soldiers? Is their happiness and their history anything but such a tissue of murders, burnings, hanging, famine, and disease, as never existed before in the annals of the world? This is the system, which, I am sure, with very different intentions, and different views of its effects, you are met this day to uphold. These are the dreadful consequences,

which those laws your petition prays may be continued, have produced upon Ireland. From the principles of that system, from the cruelty of those laws, I turn, and turn with the homage of my whole heart, to that memorable proclamation which the Head of our Church — the present monarch of these realms — has lately made to his hereditary dominions of Hanover — *That no man should be subjected to civil incapacities on account of religious opinions.* Sir, there have been many memorable things done in this reign. Hostile armies have been destroyed; fleets have been captured; formidable combinations have been broken to pieces — *but this sentiment in the mouth of a King* deserves more than all glories and victories the notice of that historian who is destined to tell to future ages the deeds of the English people. I hope he will lavish upon it every gem which glitters in the cabinet of genius, and so uphold it to the world that it will be remembered when Waterloo is forgotten, and when the fall of Paris is blotted out from the memory of man. Great as it is, Sir, this is not the only pleasure I have received in these latter days. I have seen within these few weeks a degree of wisdom in our mercantile law, such superiority to vulgar prejudice, views so just and so profound, that it seemed to me as if I was reading the works of a speculative economist, rather than the improvement of a practical politician, agreed to by a legislative assembly, and upon the eve of being carried into execution, for the benefit of a great people. Let who will be their master, I honour and praise the ministers who have learnt such a lesson. I rejoice that I have lived to see such an improvement in English affairs — that the stubborn resistance to all improvement — the contempt of all scientific reasoning, and the rigid adhesion to every stupid error which so long characterised the proceedings of this country, is fast giving way to better things, under better men, placed in better circumstances.

I confess it is not without severe pain that, in the midst of all this expansion and improvement, I perceive that in *our* profession we are still calling for the same exclusion — still asking that the same fetters may be rivetted on our fellow-creatures — still mistaking what constitutes the weakness and misfortune of the Church, for that which contributes to its glory, its dignity, and its strength. Sir, there are two petitions at this moment in this House, against two of the wisest and best measures which ever came into the British Parliament, against the impending Corn Law and against the Catholic Emancipation — the one bill intended to increase the comforts, and the other to allay the bad passions of man. Sir, I am not in a situation of life to do much good, but I will take care that I will not willingly do any evil.—The wealth of the Riding should not tempt me to petition against either of those bills. With the Corn Bill I have nothing to do at this time. Of the Catholic Emancipation Bill, I shall say, that it will be the foundation stone of a lasting religious peace; that it will give to Ireland not all that it wants, but what it most wants, and without which no other boon will be of any avail.

When this bill passes, it will be a signal to all the religious sects of that unhappy country to lay aside their mutual hatred, and to live in peace, as equal men should live under equal law — when this bill passes, the Orange flag will fall — when this bill passes, the Green flag of the rebel will fall — when this bill passes, no other flag will fly in the land of Erin than that which blends the Lion with the Harp — that flag which, wherever it does fly, is the sign of freedom and of joy — the only banner in Europe which floats over a limited King and a free people.

SPEECH AT THE TAUNTON REFORM MEETING.*

[From the *Taunton Courier.*]

Mr. Bailiff, — This is the greatest measure which has ever been before

* I was a sincere friend to Reform; I am so still. It was a great deal too violent —

Parliament in my time, and the most pregnant with good or evil to the country; and though I seldom meddle with political meetings, I could not reconcile it to my conscience to be absent from this.

Every year for this half century the question of Reform has been pressing upon us, till it has swelled up at last into this great and awful combination; so that almost every City and every Borough in England are at this moment assembled for the same purpose, and are doing the same thing we are doing. It damps the ostentation of argument and mitigates the pain of doubt, to believe (as I believe) that the measure is inevitable; the consequences may be good or bad, but done it must be; I defy the most determined enemy of popular influence, either now, or a little time from now, to prevent a Reform in Parliament. Some years ago, by timely concession, it might have been prevented. If Members had been granted to Birmingham, Leeds, and Manchester, and other great towns as opportunities occurred, a spirit of conciliation would have been evinced, and the people might have been satisfied with a Reform, which though remote would have been gradual; but with the customary blindness and insolence of human beings, the day of adversity was forgotten, the rapid improvement of the people was not noticed; the object of a certain class of politicians was to please the Court and to gratify their own arrogance by treating every attempt to expand the representation, and to increase the popular influence, with every species of contempt and obloquy: the golden opportunity was lost; and now proud lips must swallow bitter potions.

The arguments and the practices (as I remember to have heard Mr. Huskisson say) which did very well twenty years ago, will not do now. The people read too much, think too much, see too many newspapers, hear too many speeches, have their eyes too intensely fixed upon political events. But if it were possible to put off Parliamentary Reform a week ago, is it possible now? When a Monarch (whose amiable and popular manners have, I verily believe, saved us from a Revolution) approves the measure — when a Minister of exalted character plans and fashions it — when a Cabinet of such varied talent and disposition protects it — when such a body of the Aristocracy vote for it — when the hundred-horse power of the Press is labouring for it; — who does not know after this (whatever be the decision of the present Parliament) that the measure is virtually carried — and that all the struggle between such annunciation of such a plan, and its completion, is tumult, disorder, disaffection, and (it may be) political ruin?

An Honourable Member of the Honourable House, much connected with this town, and once its representative, seems to be amazingly surprised, and equally dissatisfied, at this

but the only justification is, that you cannot reform as you wish, by degrees; you must avail yourself of the few opportunities that present themselves. The Reform carried, it became the business of every honest man to turn it to good, and to see that the people (drunk with their new power) did not ruin our ancient institutions. We have been in considerable danger, and that danger is not over. What alarms me most is the large price paid by both parties for popular favour. The yeomanry were put down: nothing could be more grossly absurd—the people were rising up against the poor laws, and such an excellent and permanent force was abolished because they were not deemed a proper force to deal with popular insurrections. You may just as well object to put out a fire with pond water because pump water is better for the purpose: I say, put out the fire with the first water you can get; — but the truth is, Radicals don't like armed yeomen: they have an ugly homicide appearance. Again,—a million of revenue is given up in the nonsensical penny-post scheme, to please my old, excellent, and universally dissentient friend, Noah Warburton. I admire the Whig Ministry, and think they have done more good things than all the ministries since the Revolution; but these concessions are sad and unworthy marks of weakness, and fill reasonable men with just alarm. All this folly has taken place since they have become ministers upon principles of chivalry and gallantry; and the Tories, too, for fear of the people, have been much too quiet. There is only one principle of public conduct — *Do what you think right, and take place and power as an accident.* Upon any other plan, office is shabbiness, labour, and sorrow.

combination of King, Ministers, Nobles, and People, against his opinion:—like the gentleman who came home from serving on a jury very much disconcerted, and complaining he had met with eleven of the most obstinate people he had ever seen in his life, whom he found it absolutely impossible by the strongest arguments to bring over to his way of thinking.

They tell you, gentlemen, that you have grown rich and powerful with these rotten boroughs, and that it would be madness to part with them, or to alter a constitution which had produced such happy effects. There happens, gentlemen, to live near my parsonage a labouring man, of very superior character and understanding to his fellow-labourers; and who has made such good use of that superiority, that he has saved what is (for his station in life) a very considerable sum of money, and if his existence be extended to the common period, he will die rich. It happens, however, that he is (and long has been) troubled with violent stomachic pains, for which he has hitherto obtained no relief, and which really are the bane and torment of his life. Now, if my excellent labourer were to send for a physician, and to consult him respecting this malady, would it not be very singular language if our doctor were to say to him, "My good friend, you surely will not be so rash as to attempt to get rid of these pains in your stomach. Have you not grown rich with these pains in your stomach? have you not risen under them from poverty to prosperity? has not your situation, since you were first attacked, been improving every year? You surely will not be so foolish and so indiscreet as to part with the pains in your stomach?" — Why, what would be the answer of the rustic to this nonsensical monition? "Monster of Rhubarb! (he would say) I am not rich in consequence of the pains in my stomach, but in spite of the pains in my stomach; and I should have been ten times richer, and fifty times happier, if I had never had any pains in my stomach at all." Gentlemen, these rotten boroughs are your pains in the stomach — and you would have been a much richer and greater people if you had never had them at all. Your wealth and your power have been owing, not to the debase and corrupted parts of the House of Commons, but to the many independent and honourable Members, whom it has always contained within its walls. If there had been a few more of these very valuable members for close boroughs, we should, I verily believe, have been by this time about as free as Denmark, Sweden, or the Germanised States of Italy.

They tell you of the few men of name and character who have sat for boroughs; but nothing is said of those mean and menial men who are sent down every day by their aristocratic masters to continue unjust and unnecessary wars, to prevent inquiring into profligate expenditure, to take money out of your pockets, or to do any other bad or base thing which the Minister of the day may require at their unclean hands. What mischief, it is asked, have these boroughs done? I believe there is not a day of your lives in which you are not suffering in all the taxed commodities of life from the accumulation of bad votes of bad men. But, Mr. Bailiff, if this *were otherwise*, if it really were a great political invention, that cities of 100,000 men should have no representatives, because those representatives were wanted for political ditches, political walls, and political parks; that the people should be bought and sold like any other commodity; that a retired merchant should be able to go into the market and buy ten shares in the government of twenty millions of his fellow-subjects; yet, can such asseverations be made openly before the people? Wise men, men conversant with human affairs, may whisper such theories to each other in retirement; but can the People ever be taught that it is right they should be bought and sold? Can the vehemence of eloquent democrats be met with such arguments and theories? Can the doubts of honest and limited men be met by such arguments and theories? The

moment such a government is looked at by all the people, it is lost. It is impossible to explain, defend, and recommend it to the mass of mankind. And true enough it is, that as often as misfortune threatens us at home, or imitation excites us from abroad, political Reform is clamoured for by the people — there it stands, and ever will stand, in the apprehension of the multitude — Reform, the cure of every evil — Corruption, the source of every misfortune — famine, defeat, decayed trade, depressed agriculture, will all lapse into the question of Reform. Till that question is set at rest (and it may be set at rest) all will be disaffection, tumult, and perhaps (which God avert!) destruction.

But democrats and agitators (and democrats and agitators there are in the world) will not be contented with this Reform. Perhaps not, Sir; I never hope to content men whose game is never to be contented — but if they are not contented, I am sure their discontent will then comparatively be of little importance. I am afraid of them now; I have no arguments to answer them: but I shall not be afraid of them after this Bill, and would tell them boldly, in the middle of their mobs, that there was no longer cause for agitation and excitement, and that they were intending wickedly to the people. You may depend upon it such a measure would destroy their trade, as the repeal of duties would destroy the trade of the smuggler; their functions would be carried on faintly, and with little profit; you would soon feel that your position was stable, solid, and safe.

All would be well, it is urged, if they would but let the people alone. But what chance is there, I demand of these wise politicians, that the people will ever be let alone; that the orator will lay down his craft, and the demagogue forget his cunning? If many things were let alone, which never will be let alone, the aspect of human affairs would be a little varied. If the winds would let the waves alone, there would be no storms. If gentlemen would let ladies alone, there would be no unhappy marriages, and deserted damsels. If persons who can reason no better than this, would leave speaking alone, the school of eloquence might be improved. I have little hopes, however, of witnessing any of these acts of forbearance, particularly the last, and so we must (however foolish it may appear) proceed to make laws for a people who we are sure will not be let alone.

We might really imagine, from the objections made to the plan of Reform, that the great mass of Englishmen were madmen, robbers, and murderers. The Kingly power is to be destroyed, the House of Lords is to be annihilated, the Church is to be ruined, estates are to be confiscated. I am quite at a loss to find in these perpetrators of crimes — in this mass of pillagers and lunatics — the steady and respectable tradesmen and farmers, who will have votes to confer, and the steady and respectable country gentlemen, who will probably have votes to receive; — it may be true of the tradesmen of *Mauritania*, it may be just of the country gentlemen of *Fez* — it is anything but true of the English people. The English are a tranquil, phlegmatic, money-loving, money-getting people, who want to be quiet — and would be quiet if they were not surrounded by evils of such magnitude, that it would be baseness and pusillanimity not to oppose to them the strongest constitutional resistance.

Then it is said that there is to be a lack of talent in the new Parliament: it is to be composed of ordinary and inferior persons, who will bring the government of the country into contempt. But the best of all talents, gentlemen, is to conduct our affairs honestly, diligently, and economically — and this talent will, I am sure, abound as much in the new Parliament as in many previous Parliaments. Parliament is not a school for rhetoric and declamation, where a stranger would go to hear a speech, as he would go to the Opera to hear a song; but if it were otherwise — if eloquence be a necessary ornament of, and an indispensable adjunct to popular as-

semblies — can it ever be absent from popular assemblies? I have always found that all things, moral or physical, grow in the soil best suited for them. Show me a deep and tenacious earth — and I am sure the oak will spring up in it. In a low and damp soil I am equally certain of the alder and the willow. Gentlemen, the free Parliament of a free People is the native soil of eloquence — and in that soil will it ever flourish and abound — there it will produce those intellectual effects which drive before them whole tribes and nations of the human race, and settle the destinies of man. And, gentlemen, if a few persons of a less elegant and aristocratic description were to become members of the House of Commons, where would be the evil? They would probably understand the common people a great deal better, and in this way the feelings and interests of all classes of people would be better represented. The House of Commons thus organised will express more faithfully the opinions of the people.

The people are sometimes, it is urged, grossly mistaken; but are Kings never mistaken? Are the higher orders never mistaken? — never wilfully corrupted by their own interests? The people have at least this superiority, that they always intend to do what is right.

The argument of fear is very easily disposed of: he who is afraid of a knock on the head or a cut on the cheek is a coward; he who is afraid of entailing greater evils on the country by refusing the remedy than by applying it, and who acts in pursuance of that conviction, is a wise and prudent man — nothing can be more different than personal and political fear; it is the artifice of our opponents to confound them together.

The right of disfranchisement, gentlemen, must exist somewhere, and where but in Parliament? If not, how was the Scotch Union, how was the Irish Union, effected? The Duke of Wellington's Administration disfranchised at one blow 200,000 Irish voters — for no fault of theirs, and for no other reason than the best of all reasons, that public expediency required it. These very same politicians are now looking in an agony of terror at the disfranchisement of Corporations containing twenty or thirty persons, sold to their representatives, who are themselves perhaps sold to the Government: and to put an end to these enormous abuses is called *Corporation robbery*, and there are some persons wild enough to talk of compensation. This principle of compensation you will consider perhaps in the following instance to have been carried as far as sound discretion permits. When I was a young man, the place in England I remember as most notorious for highwaymen and their exploits was Finchley Common, near the metropolis; but Finchley Common, gentlemen, in the progress of improvement, came to be enclosed, and the highwaymen lost by these means the opportunity of exercising their gallant vocation. I remember a friend of mine proposed to draw up for them a petition to the House of Commons for compensation, which ran in this manner — "We, your loyal highwaymen of Finchley Common and its neighbourhood, having, at great expense, laid in a stock of blunderbusses, pistols, and other instruments for plundering the public, and finding ourselves impeded in the exercise of our calling by the said enclosure of the said Common of Finchley, humbly petition your Honourable House will be pleased to assign to us such compensation as your Honourable House in its wisdom and justice may think fit."— Gentlemen, I must leave the application to you.

An Honourable Baronet says, if Parliament is dissolved, I will go to my Borough with the bill in my hand, and will say, "I know of no crime you have committed, I found nothing proved against you: I voted against the bill, and am come to fling myself upon your kindness, with the hope that my conduct will be approved, and that you will return me again to Parliament." That Honourable Baronet may, perhaps, receive from his Borough an answer he little expects — "We are above being bribed by such a childish and unworthy artifice; we do not choose

to consult our own interest at the expense of the general peace and happiness of the country; we are thoroughly convinced a Reform ought to take place; we are very willing to sacrifice a privilege we ought never to have possessed to the good of the community, and we will return no one to Parliament who is not deeply impressed with the same feeling." This, I hope, is the answer that gentlemen will receive; and this, I hope, will be the noble and generous feeling of every Borough in England.

The greater part of human improvements, gentlemen, I am sorry to say, are made after war, tumult, bloodshed, and civil commotion: mankind seem to object to every species of gratuitous happiness, and to consider every advantage as too cheap, which is not purchased by some calamity. I shall esteem it as a singular act of God's providence, if this great nation, guided by these warnings of history, not waiting till tumult for Reform, nor trusting Reform to the rude hands of the lowest of the people, shall amend their decayed institutions at a period when they are ruled by a popular Monarch, guided by an upright Minister, and blest with profound peace.

SPEECH AT TAUNTON.

[From the *Taunton Courier*.]

Mr. Chairman,—I am particularly happy to assist on this occasion, because I think that the accession of the present King is a marked and important era in English history. Another coronation has taken place since I have been in the world, but I never assisted at its celebration. I saw in it a change of masters, not a change of system. I did not understand the joy which it occasioned. I did not feel it, and I did not counterfeit what I did not feel.

I think very differently of the accession of his present Majesty. I believe I see in that accession a great probability of serious improvement, and a great increase of public happiness. The evils which have been long complained of by bold and intelligent men are now universally admitted. The public feeling, which has been so often appealed to, is now intensely excited. The remedies which have so often been called for are now at last, vigorously, wisely, and faithfully applied. I admire, gentlemen, in the present King, his love of peace—I admire in him his disposition to economy, and I admire in him, above all, his faithful and honourable conduct to those who happen to be his ministers. He was, I believe, quite as faithful to the Duke of Wellington as to Lord Grey, and would, I have no doubt, be quite as faithful to the political enemies of Lord Grey (if he thought fit to employ them) as he is to Lord Grey himself. There is in this reign no secret influence, no double ministry—on whomsoever he confers the office, to him he gives that confidence without which the office cannot be holden with honour, nor executed with effect. He is not only a peaceful King, and an economical King, but he is an honest King. So far, I believe, every individual of this company will go with me. There is another topic of eulogium, on which, before I sit down, I should like to say a few words—I mean the willingness of our present King to investigate abuses, and to reform them. If this subject be not unpleasant, I will offer upon it a very few observations—a few, because the subject is exhausted, and because, if it were not, I have no right, from my standing or my situation in this county, to detain you long upon that or any other subject.

In criticising this great question of Reform, I think there is some injustice done to its authors. Men seem to suppose that a minister can sit down and make a plan of reform with as much ease and as much exactness, and with as complete a gratification of his own will, as an architect can do in building or altering a house. But a minister of state (it should be in justice observed) works in the midst of hatred, injustice, violence, and the worst of human passions—his works are not the works of calm and unembarrassed wisdom—they are not the best that a dreamer of dreams can imagine. It is

enough if they are the best plans which the passions, parties, and prejudices of the times in which he acts will permit. In passing a Reform Bill the minister overthrows the long and deep interest which powerful men have in existing abuses — he subjects himself to the deepest hatred, and encounters the bitterest opposition. Auxiliaries he must have, and auxiliaries he can only find among the people — not the mob — but the great mass of those who have opinions worth hearing, and property worth defending — a greater mass, I am happy to say, in this country than exists in any other country on the face of the earth. Now, before the middling orders will come forward with one great impulse, they must see that something is offered them worth the price of contention ; they must see that the object is great and the gain serious. If you call them in at all, it must not be to displace one faction at the expense of another, but to put down all factions — to substitute purity and principle for corruption — to give to the many that political power which the few have unjustly taken to themselves — to get rid of evils so ancient and so vast that any other arm than the public arm would be lifted up against them in vain. This, then, I say, is one of the reasons why ministers have been compelled to make their measure a little more vigorous and decisive than a speculative philosopher, sitting in his closet, might approve of. They had a mass of opposition to contend with, which could be encountered only by a general exertion of public spirit — they had a long suffering and an often deceived public to appeal to, who were determined to suffer no longer, and to be deceived no more. The alternative was to continue the ancient abuses, or to do what they have done — and most firmly do I believe that you and I, and the latest posterity of us all, will rejoice in the decision they have made. Gradation has been called for in reform : we might, it is said, have taken thirty or forty years to have accomplished what we have done in one year. "It is not so much the magnitude of what you are doing we object to, as the suddenness." But was not gradation tendered ? Was it not said by the friends of reform — "Give us Birmingham and Manchester, and we will be satisfied"? and what was the answer ? "No Manchester, no Birmingham, no reform in any degree — all abuses as they are — all perversions as we have found them — the corruptions which our fathers bequeathed us we will hand down unimpaired and unpurified to our children." But I would say to the graduate philosopher, — "How often does a reforming minister occur ?" and if such are so common that you can command them when you please, how often does a reforming monarch occur? and how often does the conjunction of both occur ? Are you sure that a people, bursting into new knowledge, and speculating on every public event, will wait for your protracted reform ? Strike while the iron is hot — up with the arm and down with the hammer, and up again with the arm, and down again with the hammer. The iron is hot — the opportunity exists now — if you neglect it, it may not return for a hundred years to come.

There is an argument I have often heard, and that is this — Are we to be afraid ? — is this measure to be carried by intimidation ? — is the House of Lords to be overawed ? But this style of argument proceeds from confounding together two sets of feelings which are entirely distinct — personal fear and political fear. If I am afraid of voting against this bill, because a mob may gather about the House of Lords — because stones may be flung at my head — because my house may be attacked by a mob, I am a poltroon, and unfit to meddle with public affairs; but I may rationally be afraid of producing great public agitation — I may be honourably afraid of flinging people into secret clubs and conspiracies — I may be wisely afraid of making the aristocracy hateful to the great body of the people. This surely has no more to do with fear than a loose identity of name ; it is in fact prudence of the highest order ; the deliberate reflection of a wise man, who does not like what he is going to do, but likes still less the

consequences of not doing it, and who of two evils chooses the least.

There are some men much afraid of what is to happen : my lively hope of good is, I confess, mingled with very little apprehension ; but of one thing I must be candid enough to say that I am much afraid, and that is of the opinion now increasing, that the people are become indifferent to reform ; and of that opinion I am afraid, because I believe in an evil hour it may lead some misguided members of the Upper House of Parliament to vote against the bill. As for the opinion itself, I hold it in the utmost contempt. The people are waiting in virtuous patience for the completion of the bill, because they know it is in the hands of men who do not mean to deceive them. I do not believe they have given up one atom of reform — I do not believe that a great people were ever before so firmly bent upon any one measure. I put it to any man of common sense, whether he believes it possible, after the King and Parliament have acted as they have done, that the people will ever be content with much less than the present bill contains. If a contrary principle be acted upon, and the bill attempted to be got rid of altogether, I confess I tremble for the consequences, which I believe will be of the worst and most painful description; and this I say deliberately, after the most diligent and extensive inquiry. Upon that diligent inquiry, I repeat again my firm conviction, that the desire of reform has increased, not diminished; that the present repose is not indifference, but the calmness of victory, and the tranquillity of success. When I see all the wishes and appetites of created beings changed, when I see an eagle, that, after long confinement, has escaped into the air, come back to his cage and his chain, — when I see the emancipated negro asking again for the hoe which has broken down his strength, and the lash which has tortured his body, I will then, and not till then, believe that the English people will return to their ancient degradation — that they will hold out their repentant hands for those manacles which at this moment lie broken into links at their feet.

SPEECH AT TAUNTON.

[From the *Taunton Courier*, of October 12th, 1831.]

The Reverend Sydney Smith rose and said: — Mr. Bailiff, I have spoken so often on this subject, that I am sure both you and the gentlemen here present will be obliged to me for saying but little, and that favour I am as willing to confer, as you can be to receive it. I feel most deeply the event which has taken place, because, by putting the two Houses of Parliament in collision with each other, it will impede the public business, and diminish the public prosperity. I feel it as a churchman, because I cannot but blush to see so many dignitaries of the Church arrayed against the wishes and happiness of the people. I feel it more than all, because I believe it will sow the seeds of deadly hatred between the aristocracy and the great mass of the people. The loss of the bill I do not feel, and for the best of all possible reasons — because I have not the slightest idea that it *is* lost. I have no more doubt, before the expiration of the winter, that this bill will pass, than I have that the annual tax bills will pass, and greater certainty than this no man can have, for Franklin tells us, there are but two things certain in this world — death and taxes. As for the possibility of the House of Lords preventing ere long a reform of Parliament, I hold it to be the most absurd notion that ever entered into human imagination. I do not mean to be disrespectful, but the attempt of the Lords to stop the progress of reform, reminds me very forcibly of the great storm of Sidmouth, and of the conduct of the excellent Mrs. Partington on that occasion. In the winter of 1824, there set in a great flood upon that town — the tide rose to an incredible height — the waves rushed in upon the houses, and everything was threatened with destruction. In the midst of this sublime and terrible storm, Dame Partington, who lived upon the beach, was

seen at the door of her house with mop and pattens, trundling her mop, squeezing out the sea-water, and vigorously pushing away the Atlantic Ocean. The Atlantic was roused. Mrs. Partington's spirit was up; but I need not tell you that the contest was unequal. The Atlantic Ocean beat Mrs. Partington. She was excellent at a slop, or a puddle, but she should not have meddled with a tempest. Gentlemen, be at your ease — be quiet and steady. You will beat Mrs. Partington.

They tell you, gentlemen, in the debates by which we have been lately occupied, that the bill is not justified by experience. I do not think this true; but if it were true, nations are sometimes compelled to act without experience for their guide, and to trust to their own sagacity for the anticipation of consequences. The instances where this country has been compelled thus to act have been so eminently successful, that I see no cause for fear, even if we were acting in the manner imputed to us by our enemies. What precedents and what experience were there at the Reformation, when the country, with one unanimous effort, pushed out the Pope, and his grasping and ambitious clergy? — What experience, when at the Revolution we drove away our ancient race of kings, and chose another family, more congenial to our free principles? — And yet to those two events, contrary to experience, and unguided by precedents, we owe all our domestic happiness, and civil and religious freedom— and having got rid of corrupt priests, and despotic kings, by our sense and our courage, are we now to be intimidated by the awful danger of extinguishing Boroughmongers, and shaking from our neck the ignominious yoke which their baseness has imposed upon it? Go on, they say, as you have done for these hundred years last past. I answer it is impossible: five hundred people now write and read, where one hundred wrote and read fifty years ago. The iniquities and enormities of the borough system are now known to the meanest of the people. You have a different sort of men to deal with— you must change because the beings whom you govern are changed. After all, and to be short, I must say that it has always appeared to me to be the most absolute nonsense that we cannot be a great, or a rich and happy nation, without suffering ourselves to be bought and sold every five years like a pack of negro slaves. I hope I am not a very rash man, but I would launch boldly into this experiment without any fear of consequences, and I believe there is not a man here present who would not cheerfully embark with me. As to the enemies of the bill, who pretend to be reformers, I know them, I believe, better than you do, and I earnestly caution you against them. You will have no more of reform than they are compelled to grant — you will have no reform at all, if they can avoid it — you will be hurried into a war to turn your attention from reform. They do not understand you — they will not believe in the improvement you have made — they think the English of the present day are as the English of the times of Queen Anne or George the First. They know no more of the present state of their own country, than of the state of the Esquimaux Indians. Gentlemen, I view the ignorance of the present state of the country with the most serious concern, and I believe they will one day or another waken into conviction with horror and dismay. I will omit no means of rousing them to a sense of their danger; — for this object, I cheerfully sign the petition proposed by Dr. Kinglake, which I consider to be the wisest and most moderate of the two.

SPEECH BY THE REV. SYDNEY SMITH.

Stick to the Bill — it is your Magna Charta, and your Runnymede. King John made a present to the Barons. King William has made a similar present to you. Never mind; common qualities good in common times. If a man does not vote for the Bill, he is unclean — the plague-spot is upon him — push him into the lazaretto of

the last century, with Wetherell and Sadler — purify the air before you approach him — bathe your hands in Chloride of Lime, if you have been contaminated by his touch.

So far from its being a merely theoretical improvement, I put it to any man, who is himself embarked in a profession, or has sons in the same situation, if the unfair influence of Boroughmongers has not perpetually thwarted him in his lawful career of ambition and professional emolument? "I have been in three general engagements at sea," said an old sailor — "have been twice wounded ; — I commanded the boats when the French frigate, the ASTROLABE, was cut out so gallantly." "Then you are made a Post Captain?" "No. I was very near it ; but — Lieutenant Thompson cut me out, as I cut out the French frigate ; his father is Town Clerk of the Borough for which Lord F—— is Member, and, there my chance was finished." In the same manner, all over England, you will find great scholars rotting on curacies — brave captains starving in garrets — profound lawyers decayed and mouldering in the Inns of Court, because the parsons, warriors, and advocates of Boroughmongers must be crammed to saturation, before there is a morsel of bread for the man who does not sell his votes, and put his country up to auction ; and though this is of every day occurrence, the Borough system, we are told, is no practical evil.

Who can bear to walk through a slaughter-house? blood, garbage, stomachs, entrails, legs, tails, kidneys, horrors — I often walk a mile about to avoid it. What a scene of disgust and horror is an election — the base and infamous traffic of principles — a candidate of high character reduced to such means — the perjury and evasion of agents — the detestable rapacity of voters — the ten days' dominion of mammon, and Belial. The Bill lessens it — begins the destruction of such practices — affords some chance, and some means of turning public opinion against bribery, and of rendering it infamous.

But the thing I cannot, and will not bear, is this; — what right has *this* Lord, or *that* Marquis, to buy ten seats in Parliament, in the shape of Boroughs, and then to make laws to govern me? And how are these masses of power redistributed? The eldest son of my Lord is just come from Eton — he knows a good deal about Æneas and Dido, Apollo and Daphne — and that is all ; and to this boy his father gives a six-hundredth part of the power of making laws, as he would give him a horse or a double-barrelled gun. Then Vellum, the steward, is put in — an admirable man : — he has raised the estates — watched the progress of the family Road and Canal Bills — and Vellum shall help to rule over the people of Israel. A neighbouring country gentleman, Mr. Plumpkin, hunts with my lord — opens him a gate or two, while the hounds are running — dines with my Lord — agrees with my Lord — wishes he could rival the South-Down sheep of my Lord — and upon Plumpkin is conferred a portion of the government. Then there is a distant relation of the same name, in the County Militia, with white teeth, who calls up the carriage at the Opera, and is always wishing O'Connell was hanged, drawn, and quartered — then a barrister, who has written an article in the Quarterly, and is very likely to speak, and refute M'Culloch ; and these five people, in whose nomination I have no more agency than I have in the nomination of the toll-keepers of the Bosphorus, are to make laws for me and my family — to put their hands in my purse, and to sway the future destinies of this country ; and when the neighbours step in, and beg permission to say a few words before these persons are chosen, there is an universal cry of ruin, confusion, and destruction; — we have become a great people under Vellum and Plumpkin — under Vellum and Plumpkin our ships have covered the ocean — under Vellum and Plumpkin our armies have secured the strength of the Hills — to turn out Vellum and Plumpkin is not Reform, but Revolution.

Was there ever such a Ministry?

Was there ever before a real Ministry of the people? Look at the condition of the country when it was placed in their hands: the state of the house when the incoming tenant took possession: windows broken, chimneys on fire, mobs round the house threatening to pull it down, roof tumbling, rain pouring in. It was courage to occupy it; it was a miracle to save it; it will be the glory of glories to enlarge and expand it, and to make it the eternal palace of wise and temperate freedom.

Proper examples have been made among the unhappy and misguided disciples of Swing: a rope has been carried round O'Connell's legs, and a ring inserted in Cobbett's nose. Then the Game Laws!!! Was ever conduct so shabby as that of the two or three governments which preceded that of Lord Grey? The cruelties and enormities of this code had been thoroughly exposed; and a general conviction existed of the necessity of a change. Bills were brought in by various gentlemen, containing some trifling alteration in this abominable code, and even these were sacrificed to the tricks and manœuvres of some noble Nimrod, who availed himself of the emptiness of the town in July, and flung out the Bill. Government never stirred a step. The fulness of the prisons, the wretchedness and demoralisation of the poor, never came across them. The humane and considerate Peel never once offered to extend his ægis over them. It had nothing to do with the state of party; and some of their double-barrelled voters might be offended. In the meantime, for every ten pheasants which fluttered in the wood, one English peasant was rotting in gaol. No sooner is Lord Althorp Chancellor of the Exchequer, than he turns out of the house a trumpery and (perhaps) an insidious Bill for the improvement of the Game Laws; and in an instant offers the assistance of Government for the abolition of the whole code.

Then look at the gigantic Brougham, sworn in at 12 o'clock, and before 6 has a bill on the table, abolishing the abuses of a Court which has been the curse of the people of England for centuries. For twenty-five long years did Lord Eldon sit in that Court, surrounded with misery and sorrow, which he never held up a finger to alleviate. The widow and the orphan cried to him as vainly as the town crier cries when he offers a small reward for a full purse; the bankrupt of the Court became the lunatic of the Court, estates mouldered away, and mansions fell down; but the fees came in, and all was well. But in an instant the iron mace of Brougham shivered to atoms this house of fraud and of delay; and this is the man who will help to govern you; who bottoms his reputation on doing good to you; who knows, that to reform abuses is the safest basis of fame, and the surest instrument of power; who uses the highest gifts of reason, and the most splendid efforts of genius, to rectify those abuses, which all the genius and talent of the profession * have hitherto been employed to justify, and to protect. Look to Brougham, and turn you to that side where he waves his long and lean finger; and mark well that face which nature has marked so forcibly — which dissolves pensions — turns jobbers into honest men — scares away the plunderer of the public — and is a terror to him who doeth evil to the people. But, above all, look to the Northern Earl, victim, before this honest and manly reign, of the spitefulness of the Court. You may now, for the first time, learn to trust in the professions of a Minister; you are directed by a man who prefers character to place, and who has given such unequivocal proofs of honesty and patriotism, that his image ought to be amongst your household gods, and his name to be lisped by your children: two thousand years hence it will be a legend like the fable of Perseus and Andromeda: Britannia chained to a mountain—two hundred rotten animals menacing her destruction, till a tall Earl, armed with Schedule A., and followed by his page Russell, drives them into the deep, and delivers over Britannia in safety to

* Lord Lyndhurst is an exception; I firmly believe he had no wish to perpetuate the abuses of the Court of Chancery.

crowds of ten-pound renters, who deafen the air with their acclamations. Forthwith, Latin verses upon this — school exercises — boys whipt, and all the usual absurdities of education. Don't part with the Administration composed of Lord Grey and Lord Brougham; and not only these, but look at them all — the mild wisdom of Lansdowne — the genius and extensive knowledge of Holland, in whose bold and honest life there is no varying nor shadow of change — the unexpected and exemplary activity of Lord Melbourne — and the rising parliamentary talents of Stanley. You are ignorant of your best interests, if every vote you can bestow is not given to such a ministry as this.

You will soon find an alteration of behaviour in the upper orders when elections become real. You will find that you are raised to the importance to which you ought to be raised. The merciless ejector, the rural tyrant, will be restrained within the limits of decency and humanity, and will improve their own characters, at the same time that they better your condition.

It is not the power of aristocracy that will be destroyed by these measures, but the *unfair* power. If the Duke of Newcastle is kind and obliging to his neighbours, he will probably lead his neighbours; if he is a man of sense, he will lead them more certainly, and to a better purpose. All this is as it should be; but the Duke of Newcastle, at present, by buying certain old houses, could govern his neighbours and legislate for them, even if he had not five grains of understanding, and if he were the most churlish and brutal man under heaven. The present state of things renders unnecessary all those important virtues, which rich and well-born men, under a better system, would exercise for the public good. The Duke of Newcastle (I mention him only as an instance), Lord Exeter will do as well, but either of those noblemen, depending not upon walls, arches, and abutments, for their power — but upon mercy, charity, forbearance, indulgence, and example — would pay this price, and lead the people by their affections; one would be the God of Stamford, and the other of Newark. This union of the great with the many is the real healthy state of a country; such a country is strong to invincibility—and this strength the Borough system entirely destroys.

Cant words creep in, and affect quarrels; the changes are rung between Revolution and Reform; but, first settle whether a wise government ought to attempt the measure—whether anything is wanted — whether less would do — and, having settled this, mere nomenclature becomes of very little consequence. But, after all, if it be Revolution, and not Reform, it will only induce me to receive an old political toast in a twofold meaning, and with twofold pleasure. When King William and the great and glorious Revolution are given, I shall think not only of escape from bigotry, but exemption from corruption; and I shall thank Providence, which has given us a second King William for the destruction of vice, as the other of that name was given us for the conservation of freedom.

All former political changes, proposed by these very men, it is said, were mild and gentle, compared to this: true, but are you on Saturday night to seize your apothecary by the throat, and to say to him, "Subtle compounder, fraudulent posologist, did not you order me a drachm of this medicine on Monday morning, and now you declare, that nothing short of an ounce can do me any good?" "True enough," would he of the phials reply, "*but you did not take the drachm on Monday morning* — that makes all the difference, my dear Sir; if you had done as I advised you at first, the small quantity of medicine would have sufficed; and, instead of being in a night-gown and slippers upstairs, you would have been walking vigorously in Piccadilly. Do as you please—and die if you please; but don't blame me because you despised my advice, and by your own ignorance and obstinacy have entailed upon yourself tenfold rhubarb and unlimited infusion of senna."

Now see the consequences of having a manly Leader, and a manly Cabinet. Suppose they had come out with a little ill-fashioned seven months' reform; what would have been the consequence? The same opposition from the Tories — that would have been quite certain — and not a single Reformer in England satisfied with the measure. You have now a real Reform, and a fair share of power delegated to the people.

The Anti-Reformers cite the increased power of the press — this is the very reason why I want an increased power in the House of Commons. The Times, Herald, Advertiser, Globe, Sun, Courier, and Chronicle, are a heptarchy, which govern this country, and govern it because the people are so badly represented. I am perfectly satisfied, that with a fair and honest House of Commons the power of the press would diminish — and that the greatest authority would centre in the highest place.

Is it possible for a gentleman to get into Parliament, at present, without doing things he is utterly ashamed of — without mixing himself up with the lowest and basest of mankind? Hands, accustomed to the scented lubricity of soap, are defiled with pitch, and contaminated with filth. Is there not some inherent vice in a Government, which cannot be carried on but with such abominable wickedness, in which no gentleman can mingle without moral degradation, and the practice of crimes, the very imputation of which, on other occasions, he would repel at the hazard of his life?

What signifies a small majority in the House? The miracle is, that there should have been any majority at all; that there was not an immense majority on the other side. It was a very long period before the Courts of Justice in Jersey could put down smuggling; and why? The Judges, Counsel, Attorneys, Crier of the Court, Grand and Petty Jurymen, were all smugglers, and the High Sheriff and Constables were running goods every moonlight night.

How are you to do without a government? And what other government, if this Bill be ultimately lost, could possibly be found?! How could any country defray the ruinous expense of protecting, with troops and constables, the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel, who literally would not be able to walk from the Horse Guards to Grosvenor Square, without two or three regiments of foot to screen them from the mob; and in these hollow squares the Hero of Waterloo would have to spend his political life? By the whole exercise of his splendid military talents, by strong batteries, at Bootle's and White's, he might, on nights of great debate, reach the House of Lords; but Sir Robert would probably be cut off, and nothing could save Twiss and Lewis.

The great majority of persons returned by the new Boroughs would either be men of high reputation for talents, or persons of fortune known in the neighbourhood; they have property and character to lose. Why are they to plunge into mad and revolutionary projects of pillaging the public creditor? It is not the interest of any such man to do it; he would lose more by the destruction of public credit than he would gain by a remission of what he paid for the interest of the public debt. And if it is not the interest of any one to act in this manner, it is not the interest of the mass. How many, also, of these new legislators would there be, who were not themselves creditors of the State? Is it the interest of such men to create a revolution, by destroying the constitutional power of the House of Lords, or of the King? Does there exist in persons of that class any disposition for such changes? Are not all their feelings, and opinions, and prejudices, on the opposite side? The majority of the new members will be landed gentlemen: their genus is utterly distinct from the revolutionary tribe; they have Molar teeth; they are destitute of the carnivorous and incisive jaws of political adventurers.

There will be mistakes at first, as

there are in all changes. All young Ladies will imagine (as soon as this Bill is carried) that they will be instantly married. Schoolboys believe that Gerunds and Supines will be abolished, and that Currant Tarts must ultimately come down in price; the Corporal and Sergeant are sure of double pay; bad Poets will expect a demand for their Epics; Fools will be disappointed, as they always are; reasonable men, who know what to expect, will find that a very serious good has been obtained.

What good to the hewer of wood and the drawer of water? How is he benefited, if Old Sarum is abolished and Birmingham Members created? But if you ask this question of Reform, you must ask it of a great number of other great measures? How is he benefited by Catholic Emancipation, by the repeal of the Corporation and Test Act, by the Revolution of 1688, by any great political change? by a good government? In the first place, if many are benefited, and the lower orders are not injured, this alone is reason enough for the change. But the hewer of wood and the drawer of water *are* benefited by reform. Reform will produce economy and investigation; there will be fewer jobs, and a less lavish expenditure; wars will not be persevered in for years after the people are tired of them; taxes will be taken off the poor, and laid upon the rich; demotic habits will be more common in a country where the rich are forced to court the poor for political power; cruel and oppressive punishments (such as those for night poaching) will be abolished. If you steal a pheasant you will be punished as you ought to be, but not sent away from your wife and children for seven years. Tobacco will be 2*d.* per lb. cheaper. Candles will fall in price. These last results of an improved government will be felt. We do not pretend to abolish poverty, or to prevent wretchedness; but if peace, economy, and justice, are the results of Reform, a number of small benefits, or rather of benefits which appear small to us, but not to them, will accrue to millions of the people; and the connection between the existence of John Russell, and the reduced price of bread and cheese, will be as clear as it has been the object of his honest, wise, and useful life to make it.

Don't be led away by such nonsense; all things are dearer under a bad government, and cheaper under a good one. The real question they ask you is, What difference can any change of government make to you? They want to keep the bees from buzzing and stinging, in order that they may rob the hive in peace.

Work well! How does it work well, when every human being in-doors and out (with the exception of the Duke of Wellington) says it must be made to work better, or it will soon cease to work at all? It is little short of absolute nonsense to call a government good, which the great mass of Englishmen would, before twenty years were elapsed, if Reform were denied, rise up and destroy. Of what use have all the cruel laws been of Perceval, Eldon, and Castlereagh, to extinguish Reform? Lord John Russell, and his abettors, would have been committed to gaol twenty years ago for half only of his present Reform; and now relays of the people would drag them from London to Edinburgh; at which latter city we are told, by Mr. Dundas, that there is no eagerness for Reform. Five minutes before Moses struck the rock, this gentleman would have said that there was no eagerness for water.

There are two methods of making alterations: the one is to despise the applicants, to begin with refusing every concession, then to relax by making concessions which are always too late; by offering in 1831 what is then too late, but would have been cheerfully accepted in 1830 — gradually to O'Connellise the country, till at last, after this process has gone on for some time, the alarm becomes too great, and everything is conceded in hurry and confusion. In the meantime fresh conspiracies have been hatched by the long delay, and no gratitude is expressed for what has

been extorted by fear. In this way peace was concluded with America, and Emancipation granted to the Catholics; and in this way the war of complexion will be finished in the West Indies. The other method is, to see at a distance that the thing must be done, and to do it effectually, *and at once*; to take it out of the hands of the common people, and to carry the measure in a manly liberal manner, so as to satisfy the great majority. The merit of this belongs to the Administration of Lord Grey. He is the only Minister I know of who has begun a great measure in good time, conceded at the beginning of twenty years what would have been extorted at the end of it, and prevented that folly, violence, and ignorance, which emanate from a long denial and extorted concession of justice to great masses of human beings. I believe the question of Reform, or any dangerous agitation of it, is set at rest for thirty or forty years; and this is an eternity in politics.

Boroughs are not the power proceeding from wealth. Many men who have no Boroughs are infinitely richer than those who have — but it is the artifice of wealth in seizing hold of certain localities. The Boroughmonger is like rheumatism, which owes its power not so much to the intensity of the pain as to its peculiar position; a little higher up, or a little lower down, the same pain would be trifling; but it fixes in the joints, and gets into the head-quarters of motion and activity. The Boroughmonger knows the importance of arthritic positions; he disdains muscle, gets into the joints, and lords it over the whole machine by felicity of place. Other men are as rich — but those riches are not fixed in the critical spot.

I live a good deal with all ranks and descriptions of people; I am thoroughly convinced that the party of Democrats and Republicans is very small and contemptible; that the English love their institutions — that they love not only this King, (who would not love him?) but the kingly office — that they have no hatred to the Aristocracy. I am not afraid of trusting English happiness to English Gentlemen. I believe that the half million of new voters will choose much better for the public, than the twenty or thirty Peers, to whose usurped power they succeed.

If any man doubt of the power of Reform, let him take these two memorable proofs of its omnipotence. First, but for the declaration against it, I believe the Duke of Wellington might this day have been in office; and, secondly, in the whole course of the debates at County Meetings and in Parliament, there are not twenty men who have declared against Reform. Some advance an inch, some a foot, some a yard — but nobody stands still — nobody says, We ought to remain just where we were — everybody discovers that he is a Reformer, and has long been so — and appears infinitely delighted with this new view of himself. Nobody appears without the cockade — bigger or less — but always the cockade.

An exact and elaborate census is called for — vast information should have been laid upon the table of the House — great time should have been given for deliberation. All these objections, being turned into English, simply mean, that the chances of another year should have been given for defeating the Bill. In that time the Poles may be crushed, the Belgians organised, Louis Philippe dethroned; war may rage all over Europe — the popular spirit may be diverted to other objects. It is certainly provoking that the Ministry foresaw all these possibilities and determined to model the iron while it was red and glowing.

It is not enough that a political institution works well practically: it must be defensible; it must be such as will bear discussion, and not excite ridicule and contempt. It might work well for aught I know, if, like the savages of Onelashka, we sent out to catch a king: but who could defend a coronation by chase? who can defend the payment of 40,000*l.* for the three-hundredth part of the power of Parliament, and the resale of this power to

Government for places to the Lord Williams and Lord Charles's, and others of the Anglophagi? Teach a million of the common people to read — and such a government (work it ever so well) must perish in twenty years. It is impossible to persuade the mass of mankind that there are not other and better methods of governing a country. It is so complicated, so wicked, such envy and hatred accumulate against the gentlemen who have fixed themselves on the joints, that it cannot fail to perish, and to be driven, as it *is* driven, from the country by a general burst of hatred and detestation. I meant, gentlemen, to have spoken for another half hour, but I am old and tired. Thank me for ending — but, gentlemen, bear with me for another moment; one word before I end. I am old, but I thank God I have lived to see more than my observations on human nature taught me I had any right to expect. I have lived to see an honest King, in whose word his Ministers can trust; who disdains to deceive those men whom he has called to the public service, but makes common cause with them for the common good; and exercises the highest powers of a ruler for the dearest interests of the State. I have lived to see a King with a good heart, who, surrounded by Nobles, thinks of common men; who loves the great mass of English people, and wishes to be loved by them; who knows that his real power, as he feels that his happiness, is founded on their affection. I have lived to see a King, who, without pretending to the pomp of superior intellect, has the wisdom to see, that the decayed institutions of human policy require amendment; and who, in spite of clamour, interest, prejudice, and fear, has the manliness to carry these wise changes into immediate execution. Gentlemen, farewell: shout for the King.

A

LETTER TO THE ELECTORS

UPON

THE CATHOLIC QUESTION.

Why is not a Catholic to be believed on his oath?

What says the law of the land to this extravagant piece of injustice? It is no challenge against a juryman, to say he is a Catholic; he sits in judgment upon your life and your property. Did any man ever hear it said that such or such a person was put to death, or that he lost his property, because a Catholic was among the jurymen? Is the question ever put? Does it ever enter into the mind of the attorney or the counsellor to inquire of the faith of the jury? If a man sell a horse, or a house, or a field, does he ask if the purchaser be a Catholic? Appeal to your own experience, and try by that fairest of all tests—the justice of this enormous charge.

We are in treaty with many of the powers of Europe, because we believe in the good faith of Catholics. Two-thirds of Europe are, in fact, Catholics; are they all perjured? For the first fourteen centuries all the Christian world were Catholics; did they live in a constant state of perjury? I am sure these objections against the Catholics are often made by very serious and honest men, but I much doubt if Voltaire has advanced anything against the Christian religion so horrible as to say that two-thirds of those who profess it are unfit for all the purposes of civil life; for who is fit to live in society who does not respect oaths? But if this imputation be true, what folly to agitate such questions as the civil emancipation of the Catholics! If they are always ready to support falsehood by an appeal to God, why are they suffered to breathe the air of England, or to drink of the waters of England? Why are they not driven into the howling wilderness? But now they possess, and bequeath, and witness, and decide civil rights; and save life as physicians, and defend property as lawyers, and judge property as jurymen; and you pass laws enabling them to command all your fleets and armies *, and then you turn round upon the very man whom you have made the master of the European seas, and the arbiter of nations, and tell him he is not to be believed on his oath.

I have lived a little in the world, but I never happened to hear a single Catholic even suspected of getting into office by violating his oath; the oath which they are accused of violating is an insuperable barrier to them all. Is there a more disgraceful spectacle in the world than that of the Duke of Norfolk hovering round the House of Lords in the execution of his office, which he cannot enter as a peer of the realm? disgraceful to the bigotry and

* There is no law to prevent a Catholic from having the command of a British fleet or a British army.

injustice of his country—to his own sense of duty, honourable in the extreme : he is the leader of a band of ancient and high-principled gentlemen, who submit patiently to obscurity and privation, rather than do violence to their conscience. In all the fury of party, I never heard the name of a single Catholic mentioned, who was suspected of having gained, or aimed at, any political advantage, by violating his oath. I have never heard so bitter a slander supported by the slightest proof. Every man in the circle of his acquaintance has met with Catholics, and lived with them probably as companions. If this immoral lubricity were their characteristic, it would surely be perceived in common life. Every man's experience would corroborate the imputation; but I can honestly say that some of the best and most excellent men I have ever met with have been Catholics; perfectly alive to the evil and inconvenience of their situation, but thinking themselves bound by the law of God and the law of honour, not to avoid persecution by falsehood and apostasy. But why (as has been asked ten thousand times before) do you lay such a stress upon these oaths of exclusion, if the Catholics do not respect oaths ? You compel me, a Catholic, to make a declaration against transubstantiation, for what purpose but to keep me out of Parliament ? Why, then, I respect oaths and declarations, or else I should perjure myself, and get into Parliament; and if I do not respect oaths, of what use is it to enact them in order to keep me out ? A farmer has some sheep, which he chooses to keep from a certain field, and to effect this object, he builds a wall : there are two objections to his proceeding; the first is, that it is for the good of the farm that the sheep should come into the field; and so the wall is not only useless, but pernicious. The second is, that he himself thoroughly believes at the time of building the wall, that all the sheep are in the constant habit of leaping over such walls. His first intention with respect to the sheep is absurd, his means more absurd, and his error is perfect in all its parts. He tries to do that which, if he succeed, will be very foolish, and tries to do it by means which he himself, at the time of using them, admits to be inadequate to the purpose : but I hope this objection to the oaths of Catholics is disappearing; I believe neither Lord Liverpool, nor Mr. Peel (a very candid and honourable man), nor the Archbishops (who are both gentlemen), nor Lord Eldon, nor Lord Stowell (whose Protestantism nobody calls in question), would make such a charge. It is confined to provincial violence, and to the politicians of the second table. I remember hearing the Catholics from the hustings of an election accused of disregarding oaths, and within an hour from that time, I saw five Catholic voters rejected, because they would not take the oath of supremacy; and these were not men of rank who tendered themselves, but ordinary tradesmen. The accusation was received with loud huzzas; the poor Catholics retired unobserved and in silence. No one praised the conscientious feelings of the constituents; no one rebuked the calumny of the candidate. This is precisely the way in which the Catholics are treated : the very same man who encourages among his partisans the doctrine, that Catholics are not to be believed upon their oaths, directs his agents upon the hustings to be very watchful that all Catholics should be prevented from voting, by tendering to them the oath of supremacy, which he is certain not one of them will take. If this be not calumny and injustice, I know not what human conduct can deserve the name.

If you believe the oath of a Catholic, see what he will swear, and what he will not swear : read the oaths he already takes, and say whether in common candour, or in common sense, you can require more security than he offers you. Before the year 1793, the Catholic was subject to many more vexatious laws than he now is; in that year an act passed in his favour; but before the Catholic could exempt himself from his ancient pains and penalties, it was necessary to take an oath. This oath was, I believe, drawn up by Dr. Dui-

genan, the bitter and implacable enemy of the sect; and it is so important an oath, so little known and read in England, that I cannot, in spite of my wish to be brief, abstain from quoting it. I deny your right to call No Popery, till you are master of its contents.

"I do swear that I do abjure, condemn, and detest, as unchristian and impious, the principle, that it is lawful to murder, destroy, or any ways injure, any person whatsoever, for or under the pretext of being a heretic; and I do declare solemnly, before God, that I believe no act, in itself unjust, immoral, or wicked, can ever be justified or excused by or under pretence or colour, that it was done either for the good of the Church, or in obedience to any ecclesiastical power whatsoever. I also declare that it is not an article of the Catholic faith, neither am I thereby required to believe or profess, that the Pope is infallible; or that I am bound to obey any order, in its own nature immoral, though the Pope, or any ecclesiastical power, should issue or direct such order; but, on the contrary, I hold that it would be sinful in me to pay any respect or obedience thereto. I further declare, that I do not believe that any sin whatsoever committed by me, can be forgiven at the mere will of any pope or any priest, or of any persons whatsoever; but that sincere sorrow for past sins, a firm and sincere resolution to avoid future guilt, and to atone to God, are previous and indispensable requisites to establish a well-founded expectation of forgiveness; and that any person who receives absolution, without these previous requisites, so far from obtaining thereby any remission of his sins, incurs the additional guilt of violating a sacrament: and I do swear, that I will defend, to the utmost of my power, the settlement and arrangement of property in this country, as established by the laws now in being.—I do hereby disclaim, disavow, and solemnly abjure any intention to subvert the present Church establishment, for the purpose of substituting a Catholic establishment in its stead; and I do solemnly swear, that I will not exercise any privilege to which I am or may become entitled, to disturb and weaken the Protestant religion, and Protestant government, in this kingdom. So help me God."

This Oath is taken by every Catholic in Ireland, and a similar oath, allowing for the difference of circumstances of the two countries, is taken in England.

It appears from the evidence taken before the two Houses, and lately printed, that if Catholic emancipation were carried, there would be little or no difficulty in obtaining from the Pope an agreement, that the nomination of the Irish Catholic Bishops should be made at home constitutionally by the Catholics, as it is now in fact*, and in practice, and that the Irish prelates would go a great way, in arranging a system of general education, if the spirit of proselytism, which now renders such a union impossible, were laid aside. This great measure carried, the Irish Catholics would give up all their endowments abroad, if they received for them an equivalent at home; for now Irish priests are fast resorting to the Continent for education, allured by the endowments which the French government are cunningly restoring and augmenting. The intercourse with the see of Rome might and would, after Catholic emancipation, be so managed, that it should be open, upon grave occasions, or, if thought proper, on every occasion, to the inspection of commissioners. There is no security, *compatible with the safety of their faith*, which the Catholics are not willing to give. But what is Catholic emancipation as far as England is concerned? not an equal right of office with the member of the Church of England, but a participation in the same pains and penalties as those to which the Protestant dissenter is subjected by the Corporation and Test Acts. If the utility of these last-mentioned laws is to be mea-

* The Catholic Bishops, since the death of the Pretender, are recommended either by the chapters or the parochial clergy, to the Pope; and there is no instance of his deviating from their choice.

sured by the horror and perturbation their repeal would excite, they are laws of the utmost importance to the defence of the English Church; but if it be of importance to the Church that pains and penalties should be thus kept suspended over men's heads, then these bills are an effectual security against Catholics as well as Protestants: and the manacles so much confided in, are not taken off, but loosened, and the prayer of a Catholic is this:—"I cannot now become an alderman, without perjury. I pray of you to improve my condition so far, that if I become an alderman, I may be only exposed to a penalty of 500*l*." There are two common errors upon the subject of Catholic emancipation; the one, that the emancipated Catholic is to be put on a better footing than the Protestant dissenter, whereas he will be put precisely on the same footing; the other, that he is to be admitted to civil offices, without any guard, exception, or reserve, whereas in the various bills which have been from time to time brought forward, the legal wit of man has been exhausted to provide against every surmise, suspicion, and whisper of the most remote danger to the Protestant Church.

The Catholic question is not an English question, but an Irish one; or rather, it is no otherwise an English question than as it is an Irish one. As for the handful of Catholics that are in England, no one, I presume, can be so extravagant as to contend, if they were the only Catholics we had to do with, that it would be of the slightest possible consequence to what offices of the state they were admitted. It would be quite as necessary to exclude the Sandemanians, who are sixteen in number, or to make a test act against the followers of Joanna Southcote, who amount to one hundred and twenty persons. A little chalk on the wall and a profound ignorance of the subject, soon raises a cry of No Popery; but I question if the danger of admitting five popish Peers and two Commoners to the benefits of the constitution could raise a mob in any market town in England. Whatever good may accrue to England from the emancipation, or evil may befall this country for withholding emancipation, will reach us *only* through the medium of Ireland.

I beg to remind you, that in talking of the Catholic religion, you must talk of the Catholic religion as it is carried on in Ireland; you have nothing to do with Spain, or France, or Italy: the religion you are to examine is the Irish Catholic religion. You are not to consider what it was, but what it is: not what individuals profess, but what is generally professed, not what individuals do, but what is generally practised. I constantly see, in advertisements from county meetings, all these species of monstrous injustice played off against the Catholics. The inquisition exists in Spain and Portugal, therefore I confound place, and vote against the Catholics of Ireland, where it never did exist, nor was purposed to be instituted.* There have been many cruel persecutions of Protestants by Catholic governments; and, therefore, I will confound time and place, and vote against the Irish, who live centuries after these persecutions, and in a totally different country. Doctor this, or Doctor that, of the Catholic Church, has written a very violent and absurd pamphlet; therefore I will confound persons, and vote against the whole Irish Catholic Church, which has neither sanctioned nor expressed any such opinions. I will continue the incapacities of men of this age, because some men, in distant ages, deserved ill of other men in distant ages. They shall expiate the crimes committed, before they were born, in a land they never saw; by individuals they never heard of. I will charge them with every act of folly which they have never sanctioned and cannot control. I will sacrifice space, time, and identity, to my zeal for the Protestant Church. Now, in the midst of all this violence, consider, for a moment, how you are imposed upon by words,

* While Mary was burning Protestants in England, not a single Protestant was executed in Ireland: and yet the terrors of that reign are, at this moment, one of the most operative causes of the exclusion of Irish Catholics.

and what a serious violation of the rights of your fellow-creatures you are committing. Mr. Murphy lives in Limerick, and Mr. Murphy and his son are subjected to a thousand inconveniences and disadvantages, because they are Catholics. Murphy is a wealthy, honourable, excellent man; he ought to be in the corporation; he cannot get in because he is a Catholic. His son ought to be king's counsel for his talents, and his standing at the bar; he is prevented from reaching this dignity, because he is a Catholic. Why, what reasons do you hear for all this? Because Queen Mary, three hundred years before the natal day of Mr. Murphy, murdered Protestants in Smithfield; because Louis XIV. dragooned his Protestant subjects, when the predecessor of Murphy's predecessor was not in being; because men are confined in prison in Madrid, twelve degrees more south than Murphy has ever been in his life; all ages, all climates, are ransacked to perpetuate the slavery of Murphy, the ill-fated victim of political anachronisms.

Suppose a barrister, in defending a prisoner, were to say to the judge, "My Lord, I humbly submit to your Lordship that this indictment against the prisoner cannot stand good in law; and as the safety of a fellow-creature is concerned, I request your Lordship's patient attention to my objections. In the first place, the indictment does not pretend that the prisoner at the bar is himself guilty of the offence, but that some persons of the same religious sect as himself are so; in whose crime he cannot (I submit) by any possibility be implicated, as these criminal persons lived three hundred years before the prisoner was born. In the next place, my Lord, the *venue* of several crimes imputed to the prisoner is laid in countries to which the jurisdiction of this court does not extend; in France, Spain, and Italy, where also the prisoner has never been: and as to the argument used by my learned brother, that it is only want of power, and not want of will, and that the prisoner *would* commit the crime *if* he *could*; I humbly submit that the custom of England has been to wait for the overt act before pain and penalty are inflicted, and that your Lordship would pass a most doleful assize, if punishment depended upon evil volition; if men were subjected to legal incapacities from the mere suspicion that they *would* do harm *if* they *could*; and if it were admitted to be sufficient proof of this suspicion, that men of this faith in distant ages, different countries, and under different circumstances, had planned evil, and, when occasion offered, done it."

When are mercy and justice, in fact, ever to return upon the earth, if the sins of the elders are to be for ever visited on these who are not even their children? Should the first act of liberated Greece be to recommence the Trojan war? Are the French never to forget the Sicilian vespers; or the Americans the long war waged against their liberties? Is any rule wise, which may set the Irish to recollect what they have suffered?

The real danger is this—that you have four Irish Catholics for one Irish Protestant. That is the matter of fact, which none of us can help. Is it better policy to make friends, rather than enemies, of this immense population? I allow there is danger to the Protestant Church, but much more danger, I am sure there is, in resisting than admitting the claims of the Catholics. If I might indulge in visions of glory, and imagine myself an Irish dean or bishop, with an immense ecclesiastical income; if the justice or injustice of the case were entirely indifferent to me, and my only object were to live at ease in my possessions, *there is no measure for which I should be so anxious as that of Catholic emancipation.* The Catholics are now extremely angry and discontented at being shut out from so many offices and honours: the incapacities to which they are subjected thwart them in all their pursuits: they feel they are a degraded caste. The Protestant feels he is a privileged caste, and not only the Protestant gentleman feels this, but every Protestant servant feels it, and takes care that his Catholic fellow-servant shall perceive it. The difference between

the two religions is an eternal source of enmity, ill-will, and hatred, and the Catholic remains in a state of permanent disaffection to the government under which he lives. I repeat that if I were a member of the Irish Church, I should be afraid of this position of affairs. I should fear it in peace, on account of riot and insurrection, and in war, on account of rebellion. I should think that my greatest security consisted in removing all just cause of complaint from the Catholic society, in endearing them to the English constitution, by making them feel, as soon as possible, that they shared in its blessings. I should really think my tithes and my glebe, upon such a plan, worth twenty years' purchase more than under the present system. Suppose the Catholic layman were to think it an evil, that his own church should be less splendidly endowed than that of the Protestant Church, whose population is so inferior; yet if he were free himself, and had nothing to complain of, he would not rush into rebellion and insurrection, merely to augment the income of his priest. At present you bind the laity and clergy in one common feeling of injustice; each feels for himself, and talks of the injuries of the other. The obvious consequence of Catholic emancipation would be to separate their interests. But another important consequence of Catholic emancipation would be to improve the condition of the clergy. Their chapels would be put in order, their incomes increased, and we should soon hear nothing more of the Catholic Church. If this measure were carried in March, I believe by the January following, the whole question would be as completely forgotten as the sweating sickness, and that nine Doctor Doyles, at the rate of thirty years to a Doyle, would pass away one after the other, before any human being heard another syllable on the subject. All men gradually yield to the comforts of a good income. Give the Irish archbishop 1200*l.* per annum; the bishop 800*l.*, the priest 200*l.*, the coadjutor 100*l.* per annum, and the Cathedral of Dublin is almost as safe as the Cathedral of York.* This is the real secret of putting an end to the Catholic question; there is no other; *but, remember, I am speaking of provision for the Catholic clergy after emancipation, not before.* There is not an Irish clergyman of the Church of Rome who would touch one penny of the public money before the laity were restored to civil rights, and why not pay the Catholic clergy as well as the Presbyterian clergy? Ever since the year 1803, the Presbyterian clergy in the North of Ireland have been paid by the government, and the grant is annually brought forward in parliament; and not only are the Presbyterians paid, but one or two other species of Protestant Dissenters. The consequence has been loyalty and peace. This way of appeasing Dissenters you may call expensive, but is there no expense in injustice? You have at this moment an army of 20,000 men in Ireland, horse, foot, and artillery, at an annual expense of a million and a half of money; about one third of this sum would be the expense of the allowance to the Catholic clergy; and this army is so necessary, that the government dare not at this moment remove a single regiment from Ireland. Abolish these absurd and disgraceful distinctions, and a few troops of horse, to help the constables on fair days, will be more than sufficient for the Catholic limb of the empire.

Now for a very few of the shameful misrepresentations circulated respecting the Irish Catholics, for I repeat again that we have nothing to do with

* I say *almost*, because I hate to overstate an argument, and it is impossible to deny that there is danger to a Church, to which seven millions contribute largely, and in which six millions disbelieve: my argument merely is, that such a Church would be more safe in proportion as it interfered less with the comforts and ease of its natural enemies, and rendered their position more desirable and agreeable. I firmly believe the Toleration Act to be quite as conducive to the security of the Church of England as it is to the Dissenters. Perfect toleration, and the abolition of every incapacity as a consequence of religious opinions, is not, what is commonly called, a receipt for innovation, but a receipt for the quiet and permanence of every establishment which has the real good sense to adopt it.

Spanish or Italian, but with Irish Catholics: it is not true that the Irish Catholics refuse to circulate the Bible in English; on the contrary, they have in Ireland circulated several editions of the Scriptures in English. In the last year, the Catholic prelates prepared and put forth a stereotype edition of the Bible, of a small print and low price, to insure its general circulation. They circulate the Bible with their own notes, and how, as Catholics, can they act otherwise? Are not our prelates and Bartlett's Buildings acting in the same manner? And must not all Churches, if they are consistent, act in the same manner? The Bibles Catholics quarrel with, are Protestant Bibles without notes, or Protestant Bibles with Protestant notes, and how can they do otherwise without giving up their religion? They deny, upon oath, that the infallibility of the Pope is any necessary part of the Catholic faith. They, upon oath, declare that Catholic people are forbidden to worship images, and saints, and relics. They, upon oath, abjure the temporal power of the Pope, or his right to absolve any Catholic from his oath. They renounce, upon oath, all right to forfeited lands, and covenant, upon oath, not to destroy or plot against the Irish Protestant Church. What more can any man want, whom anything will content?

Some people talk as if they were quite teased and worried by the eternal clamours of the Catholics; but if you are eternally unjust, can you expect anything more than to be eternally vexed by the victims of your injustice? You want all the luxury of oppression, without any of its inconvenience. I should think the Catholics very much to blame, if they ever ceased to importune the legislature for justice, so long as they could find one single member of parliament who would advocate their cause.

The putting the matter to rest by an effort of the county of York, or by any decision of parliament against them, is utterly hopeless. Every year increases the Catholic population, and the Catholic wealth, and the Catholic claims, till you are caught in one of those political attitudes to which all countries are occasionally exposed, in which you are utterly helpless, and must give way to their claims: and if you do it then, you will do it badly; you may call it an arrangement, but arrangements made at such times are much like the bargains between a highwayman and a traveller, a pistol on one side, and a purse on the other: the rapid scramble of armed violence, and the unqualified surrender of helpless timidity. *If you think the thing must be done at some time or another, do it when you are calm and powerful, and when you need not do it.*

There are a set of high-spirited men who are very much afraid of being afraid; who cannot brook the idea of doing anything from fear, and whose conversation is full of fire and sword, when any apprehension of resistance is alluded to. I have a perfect confidence in the high and unyielding spirit, and in the military courage of the English; and I have no doubt, but that many of the country gentlemen who now call out No Popery, would fearlessly put themselves at the head of their embattled yeomanry, to control the Irish Catholics. My objection to such courage is, that it would certainly be exercised unjustly, and probably exercised in vain. I should deprecate any rising of the Catholics as the most grievous misfortune which could happen to the empire and to themselves. They had far better endure all they do endure, and a great deal worse, than try the experiment. *But if they do try it, you may depend upon it, they will do it at their own time, and not at yours.* They will not select a fortnight in the summer, during a profound peace, when corn and money abound, and when the Catholics of Europe are unconcerned spectators. If you make a resolution to be unjust, you must make another resolution to be always strong, always vigilant, and always rich; you must commit no blunders, exhibit no deficiencies, and meet with no misfortunes; you must present a square phalanx of impenetrable strength, for keen-eyed revenge is riding round

your ranks; and if one heart falter, or one hand tremble, you are lost.

You may call all this threatening; I am sure I have no such absurd intention; but wish only, in sober sadness, to point out what appears to me to be the inevitable consequences of the conduct we pursue. If danger be not pointed out and insisted upon, how is it to be avoided? My firm belief is, that England will be compelled to grant ignominiously what she now refuses haughtily. Remember what happened respecting Ireland in the American war. In 1779, the Irish, whose trade was completely restricted by English laws, asked for some little relaxation, some liberty to export her own products, and to import the products of other countries; their petition was flung out of the House with the utmost disdain, and by an immense majority. In April, 1782, 70,000 Irish volunteers were under arms, the representatives of 170 armed corps met at Ulster, and the English parliament (the Lords and Commons both on the same day and with only one dissentient voice, the ministers moving the question) were compelled, in the most disgraceful and precipitate manner, to acknowledge the complete independence of the Irish nation, *and nothing but the good sense and moderation of Grattan prevented the separation of the two crowns.*

It is no part of my province to defend every error of the Catholic Church: I believe it has many errors, though I am sure these errors are grievously exaggerated and misrepresented. I should think it a vast accession to the happiness of mankind, if every Catholic in Europe were converted to the Protestant faith. The question is not, Whether there shall be Catholics, but the question (as they do exist and you cannot get rid of them) is, What are you to do with them? Are you to make men rebels because you cannot make them Protestants? and are you to endanger your state, because you cannot enlarge your Church? England is the ark of liberty: the English Church I believe to be one of the best establishments in the world; but what is to become of England, of its Church, its free institutions, and the beautiful political model it holds out to mankind, if Ireland should succeed in connecting itself with any other European power hostile to England? I join in the cry of No Popery, as lustily as any man in the streets, who does not know whether the Pope lives in Cumberland or Westmoreland; but I know that it is impossible to keep down European popery, and European tyranny, without the assistance, or with the opposition of Ireland. If you give the Irish their privileges, the spirit of the nation will overcome the spirit of the Church: they will cheerfully serve you against all enemies, and chant a *Te Deum* for your victories over all the Catholic armies of Europe. If it be true, as her enemies say, that the Roman Catholic Church is waging war all over Europe against common sense, against public liberty; selling the people to kings and nobles, and labouring for the few against the many; all this is an additional reason why I would fortify England and Protestantism by every concession to Ireland; why I should take care that our attention was not distracted, nor our strength wasted by internal dissension; why I would not paralyse those arms which wield the sword of Justice among the nations of the world, and lift up the buckler of safety. If the Catholic religion in Ireland is an abuse, you must tolerate that abuse, to prevent its extension and tyranny over the rest of Europe. If you will take a long view instead of a confined view, and look generally to the increase of human happiness, *the best check upon the increase of Popery, the best security for the Establishment of the Protestant Church is, that the British Empire shall be preserved in a state of the greatest strength, union, and opulence.* My cry then is, *No Popery;* therefore, emancipate the Catholics, that they may not join with foreign papists in time of war. *Church for ever;* therefore emancipate the Catholics, that they may not help to pull it down. *King for ever;* therefore emancipate the Catholics, that they may become his loyal subjects. *Great Bri-*

tain for ever; therefore emancipate the Catholics, that they may not put an end to its perpetuity. *Our Government is essentially Protestant;* therefore, by emancipating the Catholics, give up a few circumstances which have nothing to do with the essence. *The Catholics are disguised enemies;* therefore, by emancipation, turn them into open friends. *They have a double allegiance;* therefore, by emancipation, make their allegiance to their King so grateful, that they never will confound it with the spiritual allegiance to their Pope. It is very difficult for electors, who are much occupied by other matters, to choose the right path amid the rage and fury of faction: but I give you one mark, *vote for a free altar;* give what the law compels you to give to the Establishment; (that done,) no chains, no prisons, no bonfires for a man's faith; and, above all, no modern chains and prisons under the names of disqualifications and incapacities, which *are only the cruelty and tyranny of a more civilised age;* civil offices open to all, a Catholic or a Protestant alderman, a Moravian or a Church of England, or a Wesleyan justice, *no oppression, no tyranny in belief: a free altar, an open road to heaven: no human insolence, no human narrowness, hallowed by the name of God.*

Every man in trade must have experienced the difficulty of getting in a bill from an unwilling paymaster. If you call in the morning, the gentleman is not up; if in the middle of the day, he is out; if in the evening, there is company. If you ask mildly, you are indifferent to the time of payment; if you press, you are impertinent. No time and no manner can render such a message agreeable. So it is with the poor Catholics; their message is so disagreeable, that their time and manner can never be right. "Not this session. Not *now:* on no account at the present time; any other time than this. The great mass of the Catholics are so torpid on the subject, that the question is clearly confined to the ambition of the few, or the whole Catholic population are so leagued together, that the object is clearly to intimidate the mother-country." In short, the Catholics want justice, and we do not mean to be just, and the most specious method of refusal is, to have it believed that they are refused from their own folly, and not from our fault.

What if O'Connell (a man certainly of extraordinary talents and eloquence) is sometimes violent and injudicious? What if O'Gorman or O'Sullivan have spoken ill of the Reformation? Is a great stroke of national policy to depend on such childish considerations as these? If these chains ought to remain, could I be induced to remove them by the chaste language and humble deportment of him who wears them? If they ought to be struck away, would I continue them, because my taste was offended by the coarse insolence of a goaded and injured captive? Would I make that great measure to depend on the irritability of my own feelings, which ought to depend upon policy and justice? The more violent and the more absurd the conduct of the Catholics, the greater the wisdom of emancipation. If they were always governed by men of consummate prudence and moderation, your justice in refusing would be the same, but your danger would be less. The levity and irritability of the Irish character are pressing reasons why all just causes of provocation should be taken away, and those high passions enlisted in the service of the empire.

In talking of the spirit of the Papal empire, it is often argued that the *will* remains the same; that the Pontiff *would*, if he *could*, exercise the same influence in Europe; that the Catholic Church *would, if it could*, tyrannise over the rights and opinions of mankind; but if the power be taken away, what signifies the will? If the Pope thunder in vain against the kingdoms of the earth, of what consequence is his disposition to thunder? If mankind are too enlightened and too humane to submit to the cruelties and hatreds of a Catholic priesthood; if the Protestants of the empire are sufficiently strong to resist it, why are we to alarm ourselves with the barren volition, unseconded by the requisite

power? I hardly know in what order or description of men I should choose to confide, if they *could* do as they *would*; the best security is, that the rest of the world will not let them do as they wish to do; and having satisfied myself of this, I am not very careful about the rest.

Our government is called essentially Protestant; but if it be essentially Protestant in the distribution of offices, it should be essentially Protestant in the imposition of taxes. The treasury is open to all religions, parliament only to one. The tax-gatherer is the most indulgent and liberal of human beings; he excludes no creed, imposes no articles; but counts Catholic cash, pockets Protestant paper; and is candidly and impartially oppressive to every description of the Christian world. Can anything be more base than when you want the blood or the money of the Catholics, to forget that they are Catholics, and to remember only that they are British subjects; and when they ask for the benefits of the British constitution, to remember only that they are Catholics, and to forget that they are British subjects?

No Popery was the cry of the great English Revolution, because the increase and prevalence of Popery in England, would, at that period, have rendered this island tributary to France. The Irish Catholics were, at that period, broken to pieces by the severity and military execution of Cromwell, and by the penal laws. They are since become a great and formidable people. The same dread of foreign influence makes it now necessary that they should be restored to political rights. Must the friends of rational liberty join in a clamour against the Catholics now, because in a very different state of the world they excited that clamour a hundred years ago? I remember a house near Battersea Bridge which caught fire, and there was a general cry of "Water, water!" Ten years after, the Thames rose, and the people of the house were nearly drowned. Would it not have been rather singular to have said to the inhabitants, "I heard you calling for water ten years ago, why don't you call for it now?"

There are some men who think the present times so incapable of forming any opinions, that they are always looking back to the wisdom of our ancestors. Now, as the Catholics sat in the English parliament to the reign of Charles II., and in the Irish parliament, I believe, till the reign of King William, the precedents are more in their favour than otherwise; and to replace them in parliament seems rather to return to, than to deviate from, the practice of our ancestors.

If the Catholics are priest-ridden, pamper the rider, and he will not stick so close; don't torment the animal ridden, and his violence will be less dangerous.

The strongest evidence against the Catholics is that of Colonel John Irvine; he puts everything against them in the strongest light, and Colonel John (with great actual, though, I am sure, with no intentional exaggeration) does not pretend to say there would be more than forty-six members returned for Ireland who were Catholics; but how many members are there in the House now returned by Catholics, and compelled, from the fear of losing their seats, to vote in favour of every measure which concerns the Catholic Church? The Catholic party, as the Colonel justly observes, was formed when you admitted them to the elective franchise. The Catholic party are increasing so much in boldness, that they will soon require of the members they return, to oppose generally any government hostile to Catholic emancipation, and they will turn out those who do not comply with this rule. If this be done, the phalanx so much dreaded from emancipation is found at once without emancipation. This consequence of resistance to the Catholic claims is well worth the attention of those who make use of the cry of No Popery, as a mere political engine.

We are taunted with our prophetical spirit, because it is said by the advocates of the Catholic question that the thing must come to pass; that it

is inevitable: our prophecy, however, is founded upon experience and common sense, and is nothing more than the application of the past to the future. In a few years' time, when the madness and wretchedness of war are forgotten, when the greater part of those who have lost in war, legs and arms, health and sons, have gone to their graves, the same scenes will be acted over again in the world. France, Spain, Russia, and America, will be upon us. The Catholics will watch their opportunity, and soon settle the question of Catholic emancipation. To suppose that any nation can go on, in the midst of foreign wars, denying common justice to seven millions of men, in the heart of the empire, awakened to their situation, and watching for the critical moment of redress, does, I confess, appear to me to be the height of extravagance. To foretell the consequence of such causes, in my humble apprehension, demands no more of shrewdness than to point out the probable results of leaving a lighted candle stuck up in an open barrel of gunpowder.

It is very difficult to make the mass of mankind believe that the state of things is ever to be otherwise than they have been accustomed to see it. I have very often heard old persons describe the impossibility of making any one believe that the American colonies could ever be separated from this country. It was always considered as an idle dream of discontented politicians, good enough to fill up the periods of a speech, but which no practical man, devoid of the spirit of party, considered to be within the limits of possibility. There was a period when the slightest concession would have satisfied the Americans; but all the world was in heroics; one set of gentlemen met at the Lamb, and another at the Lion: blood and treasure men, breathing war, vengeance, and contempt; and in eight years afterwards, an awkward looking gentleman in plain clothes walked up to the drawing-room of St. James's, in the midst of the gentlemen of the Lion and Lamb, and was introduced as the *ambassador from the United States of America.*

You must forgive me if I draw illustrations from common things — but in seeing swine driven, I have often thought of the Catholic question, and of the different methods of governing mankind. The object, one day, was to drive some of these animals along a path, to a field where they had not been before. The man could by no means succeed; instead of turning their faces to the north, and proceeding quietly along, they made for the east and the west, rushed back to the south, and positively refused to advance; a reinforcement of rustics was called for — maids, children, neighbours, all helped; a general rushing, screaming, and roaring ensued; but the main object was not in the slightest degree advanced: after a long delay we resolved (though an hour before we should have disdained such a compromise) to have recourse to Catholic emancipation: a little boy was sent before them with a handful of barley; a few grains were scattered in the path, and the bristly herd were speedily and safely conducted to the place of their destination. If, instead of putting Lord Stowell out of breath with driving, compelling the Duke of York to swear, and the Chancellor to strike at them with the mace, Lord Liverpool would condescend, in his graceful manner, to walk before the Catholic doctors with a basket of barley, what a deal of ink and blood would be saved to mankind!

Because the Catholics are intolerant, we will be intolerant; but did anybody ever hear before that a government is to imitate the vices of its subjects? If the Irish were a rash, violent, and intemperate race, are they to be treated with rashness, violence, and intemperance? If they were addicted to fraud and falsehood, are they to be treated by those who rule them with fraud and falsehood? Are there to be perpetual races in error and vice between the people and the lords of the people? Is the supreme power always to find virtues among the people; never to teach them by example, or improve them by laws and institutions? Make

all sects free, and let them learn the value of the blessing to others, by their own enjoyment of it; but if not, let them learn it by your vigilance and firm resistance to everything intolerant. Toleration will then become a habit and a practice, ingrafted upon the manners of a people, when they find the law too strong for them, and that there is no use in being intolerant.

It is very true that the Catholics have a double allegiance*, but it is equally true that their second or spiritual allegiance has nothing to do with civil policy, and does not, in the most distant manner, interfere with their allegiance to the crown. What is meant by allegiance to the crown, is, I presume, obedience to acts of parliament, and a resistance to those who are constitutionally proclaimed to be the enemies of the country. I have seen and heard of no instance for this century and a half last past, where the spiritual sovereign has presumed to meddle with the affairs of the temporal sovereign. The Catholics deny him such power by the most solemn oaths which the wit of man can devise. In every war, the army and navy are full of Catholic officers and soldiers; and if their allegiance in temporal matters is unimpeachable and unimpeached, what matters to whom they choose to pay spiritual obedience, and to adopt as their guide in genuflexion and psalmody? Suppose these same Catholics were foolish enough to be governed by a set of Chinese moralists in their diet, this would be a third allegiance; and if they were regulated by Brahmins in their dress, this would be a fourth allegiance; and if they received the directions of the Patriarch of the Greek Church, in educating their children, here is another allegiance; and as long as they fought, and paid taxes, and kept clear of the quarter sessions and assizes, what matters how many fanciful supremacies and frivolous allegiances they choose to manufacture or accumulate for themselves?

A great deal of time would be spared, if gentlemen, before they ordered their post-chaises for a No Popery meeting, would read the most elementary defence of these people, and inform themselves even of the rudiments of the question. If the Catholics meditate the resumption of the Catholic property, why do they purchase that which they know (if the fondest object of their political life succeed) must be taken away from them? Why is not an attempt made to purchase a quietus from the rebel who is watching the blessed revolutionary moment for regaining his possessions, and revelling in the unbounded sensuality of mealy and waxy enjoyments? But after all, who *are* the descendants of the rightful possessors? The estate belonged to the O'Rourkes, who were hanged, drawn, and quartered in the time of Cromwell: true; but before that, it belonged to the O'Connors, who were hanged, drawn, and quartered in the time of Henry VII. The O'Sullivans have a still earlier plea of suspension, evisceration, and division. Who *is* the rightful possessor of the estate? We forget that Catholic Ireland has been murdered three times over by its Protestant masters.

Mild and genteel people do not like the idea of persecution, and are advocates for toleration; but then they think it no act of intolerance to deprive Catholics of political power. The history of all this is, that all men secretly like to punish others for not being of the same opinion with themselves, and that this sort of privation is the only species of persecution, of which the improved feeling and advanced cultivation of the age will admit. Fire and faggot, chains and stone walls, have been clamoured away; nothing remains but to mortify a man's pride, and to limit his resources, and to set a mark upon him, by cutting him off from his fair share of political power. By this receipt insolence is gratified, and humanity is not shocked. The gentlest Protestant can see, with dry eyes, Lord Stourton excluded from parliament, though he would abominate the most

* The same double allegiance exists in every Catholic country in Europe. The spiritual head of the country among French, Spanish, and Austrian Catholics is the Pope; the political head, the king or emperor.

distant idea of personal cruelty to Mr. Petre. This is only to say that he lives in the nineteenth, instead of the sixteenth century, and that he is as intolerant in religious matters as the state of manners existing in his age will permit. Is it not the same spirit which wounds the pride of a fellow-creature on account of his faith, or which casts his body into the flames? Are they anything else but degrees and modifications of the same principle? The minds of these two men no more differ because they differ in their degrees of punishment, than their bodies differ because one wore a doublet in the time of Mary, and the other wears a coat in the reign of George. I do not accuse them of intentional cruelty and injustice: I am sure there are very many excellent men who would be shocked if they could conceive themselves to be guilty of anything like cruelty; but they innocently give a wrong name to the bad spirit which is within them, and think they are tolerant, because they are not as intolerant as they could have been in other times, but cannot be now. *The true spirit is to search after God and for another life with lowliness of heart; to fling down no man's altar, to punish no man's prayer; to heap no penalties and no pains on those solemn supplications which, in divers tongues, and in varied forms, and in temples of a thousand shapes, but with one deep sense of human dependence, men pour forth to God.*

It is completely untrue that the Catholic religion is what it was three centuries ago, or that it is unchangeable and unchanged. These are mere words, without the shadow of truth to support them. If the Pope were to address a bull to the kingdom of Ireland, excommunicating the Duke of York, and cutting him off from the succession, for his Protestant effusion in the House of Lords, he would be laughed at as a lunatic in all the Catholic chapels in Dublin. The Catholics would not now burn Protestants as heretics. In many parts of Europe, Catholics and Protestants worship in one church — Catholics at eleven, Protestants at one; they sit in the same parliament, are elected to the same office, live together without hatred or friction, under equal laws. Who can see and know these things, and say that the Catholic religion is unchangeable and unchanged?

I have often endeavoured to reflect upon the causes which, from time to time, raised such a clamour against the Catholics, and I think the following are among the most conspicuous:

1. Historical recollections of the cruelties inflicted upon the Protestants.
2. Theological differences.
3. A belief that the Catholics are unfriendly to liberty.
4. That their morality is not good.
5. That they meditate the destruction of the Protestant Church.
6. An unprincipled clamour by men who have no sort of belief in the danger of emancipation, but who make use of No Popery as a political engine.
7. A mean and selfish spirit of denying to others the advantages we ourselves enjoy.
8. A vindictive spirit or love of punishing others, who offend our self-love by presuming, on important points, to entertain opinions opposite to our own.
9. Stupid compliance with the opinions of the majority.
10. To these I must, in justice and candour, add, as a tenth cause, a real apprehension on the part of honest and reasonable men, that it is dangerous to grant further concessions to the Catholics.

To these various causes I shall make a short reply, in the order in which I have placed them.

1. Mere historical recollections are very miserable reasons for the continuation of penal and incapacitating laws, and one side has as much to recollect as the other.

2. The State has nothing to do with questions purely theological.

3. It is ill to say this in a country whose free institutions were founded by Catholics, and it is often said by men who care nothing about free institutions.

4. It is not true.

5. Make their situation so comfortable, that it will not be worth their

while to attempt an enterprise so desperate.

6. This is an unfair political trick, because it is too dangerous: it is spoiling the table in order to win the game.

The 7th and 8th causes exercise a great share of influence in every act of intolerance. The 9th must, of course, comprehend the greatest number.

10. Of the existence of such a class of No Poperists as this, it would be the height of injustice to doubt, but I confess it excites in me a very great degree of astonishment.

Suppose, after a severe struggle, you put the Irish down, if they are mad and foolish enough to recur to open violence; yet are the retarded industry, and the misapplied energies of so many millions of men, to go for nothing? Is it possible to forget all the wealth, peace, and happiness which are to be sacrificed for twenty years to come, to these pestilential and disgraceful squabbles? Is there no horror in looking forward to a long period in which men, instead of ploughing and spinning, will curse and hate, and burn and murder?

There seems to me a sort of injustice and impropriety in our deciding at all upon the Catholic question. It should be left to those Irish Protestants whose shutters are bullet-proof; whose dinner-table is regularly spread with knife, fork, and cocked pistol; salt-cellar and powder-flask. Let the opinion of those persons be resorted to, who sleep in sheet-iron nightcaps; who have fought so often and so nobly before their scullery-door, and defended the parlour passage as bravely as Leonidas defended the pass of Thermopylæ. The Irish Protestant members see and know the state of their own country. Let their votes decide* the case. We are quiet and at peace; our homes may be defended with a feather, and our doors fastened with a pin; and, as ignorant of what armed and insulted Popery is, as we are of the state of New Zealand, we pretend to regulate by our clamours the religious factions of Ireland.

* A great majority of Irish members voted for Catholic Emancipation.

It is a very pleasant thing to trample upon Catholics, and it is also a very pleasant thing to have an immense number of pheasants running about your woods; but there come thirty or forty poachers in the night, and fight with thirty or forty game-preservers; some are killed, some fractured, some scalped, some maimed for life. Poachers are caught up and hanged; a vast body of hatred and revenge accumulates in the neighbourhood of the great man; and he says, "The sport is not worth the candle. The preservation of game is a very agreeable thing, but I will not sacrifice the happiness of my life to it. This amusement, like any other, may be purchased too dearly." So it is with the Irish Protestants; they are finding out that Catholic exclusion may be purchased too dearly. Maimed cattle, fired ricks, threatening letters, barricadoed houses,—to endure all this, is to purchase superiority at too dear a rate; and this is the inevitable state of two parties, the one of whom are unwilling to relinquish their ancient monopoly of power, while the other party have, at length, discovered their strength, and are determined to be free.

Gentlemen (with the best intentions, I am sure) meet together in a county town, and enter into resolutions that no further concessions are to be made to the Catholics; but if you will not let them into Parliament, why not allow them to be king's counsel, or sergeants-at-law? Why are they excluded by law from some corporations in Ireland, and admissible, though not admitted, to others? I think, before such general resolutions of exclusion are adopted, and the rights and happiness of so many millions of people disposed of, it would be decent and proper to obtain some tolerable information of what the present state of the Irish Catholics is, and of the vast number of insignificant offices from which they are excluded. Keep them from Parliament if you think it right, but do not, therefore, exclude them from anything else, to which you think Catholics may be fairly admitted without danger; and as to their content or discontent, there can be no sort of reason why discon-

tent should not be lessened, though it cannot be removed.

You are shocked by the present violence and abuse used by the Irish Association: by whom are they driven to it? and whom are you to thank for it? Is there a hope left to them? Is any term of endurance alluded to, — any scope or boundary to their patience? Is the minister waiting for opportunities? Have they reason to believe that they are wished well to by the greatest of the great? Have they brighter hopes in another reign? Is there one clear spot in the horizon? anything that you have left to them, but that disgust, hatred, and despair, which, breaking out into wild eloquence, and acting upon a wild people, are preparing every day a mass of treason and disaffection, which may shake this empire to its very centre? and you may laugh at Daniel O'Connell, and treat him with contempt, and turn his metaphors into ridicule; but Daniel has, after all, a great deal of real and powerful eloquence; and a strange sort of misgiving sometimes comes across me, that Daniel and the Doctor are not quite so great fools as many most respectable country clergymen believe them to be.

You talk of their abuse of the Reformation — but is there any end to the obloquy and abuse with which the Catholics are upon every point, and from every quarter, assailed? Is there any one folly, vice, or crime, which the blind fury of Protestants does not lavish upon them? and do you suppose all this is to be heard in silence, and without retaliation? Abuse as much as you please, if you are going to emancipate; but if you intend to do nothing for the Catholics but to call them names, you must not be out of temper if you receive a few ugly appellations in return.

The great object of men who love party better than truth, is to have it believed that the Catholics alone have been persecutors; but what can be more flagrantly unjust than to take our notions of history only from the conquering and triumphant party? If you think the Catholics have not their Book of Martyrs as well as the Protestants, take the following enumeration of some of their most learned and careful writers: —

The whole number of Catholics who have suffered death in England for the exercise of the Roman Catholic religion since the Reformation: —

Henry VIII.	59
Elizabeth	204
James I.	25
Charles I. and Commonwealth .	23
Charles II.	8
Total	319

Henry VIII., with consummate impartiality, burnt three Protestants and hanged four Catholics for different errors in religion on the same day, and at the same place. Elizabeth burnt two Dutch Anabaptists for some theological tenets, July 22, 1575, Fox the martyrologist vainly pleading with the queen in their favour. In 1579, the same Protestant queen cut off the hand of Stubbs, the author of a tract against popish connection, of Singleton, the printer, and Page, the disperser of the book. Camden saw it done. Warburton properly says it exceeds in cruelty anything done by Charles I. On the 4th of June, Mr. Elias Thacker and Mr. John Capper, two ministers of the Brownist persuasion, were hanged at St. Edmund's-bury, for dispersing books against the Common Prayer. With respect to the great part of the Catholic victims, the law was fully and literally executed: after being hanged up, they were cut down alive, dismembered, ripped up, and their bowels burnt before their faces; after which they were beheaded and quartered. The time employed in this butchery was very considerable, and, in one instance, lasted more than half an hour.

The uncandid excuse for all this is, that the greater part of these men were put to death for political, not for religious crimes. That is, a law is first passed, making it high treason for a priest to exercise his function in England, and so, when he is caught and burnt, this is not religious persecution, but an offence against the state. We

are, I hope, all too busy to need any answer to such childish, uncandid reasoning as this.

The total number of those who suffered capitally in the reign of Elizabeth, is stated by Dodd, in his Church History*, to be one hundred and nine-nine; further inquiries made their number to be two hundred and four: fifteen of these were condemned for denying the queen's supremacy; one hundred and twenty-six for the exercise of priestly functions; and the others for being reconciled to the Catholic faith, or for aiding and assisting priests. In this list, no person is included who was executed for any plot, real or imaginary, except eleven, who suffered for the pretended plot of Rheims; a plot, which, Dr. Milner justly observes, was so daring a forgery, that even Camden allows the sufferers to have been political victims. Besides these, mention is made, in the same work, of ninety Catholic priests, or laymen, who died in prison in the same reign. "About the same time," he says, "I find fifty gentlemen lying prisoners in York Castle; *most of them perished there*, of vermin, famine, hunger, thirst, dirt, damp, fever, whipping, and broken hearts, the inseparable circumstances of prisons in those days. These were every week, for a twelvemonth together, dragged by main force to hear the established service performed in the Castle chapel." The Catholics were frequently, during the reign of Elizabeth, tortured in the most dreadful manner. In order to extort answers from Father Campian, he was laid on the rack, and his limbs stretched a little, to show him, as the executioner termed it, what the rack was. He persisted in his refusal; then for several days successively, the torture was increased, and on the last two occasions, he was so cruelly rent and torn, that he expected to expire under the torment. While under the rack, he called continually upon God. In the reign of the Protestant Edward VI., Joan Knell was burnt to death, and the year after, George Parry was burnt also. In 1575, two Protestants, Peterson and Turwort (as before stated) were burnt to death by Elizabeth. In 1589, under the same queen, Lewes, a Protestant, was burnt to death at Norwich, where Francis Kett was also burnt for religious opinions, in 1589, under the same great queen; who, in 1591, hanged the Protestant Hacket for heresy, in Cheapside, and put to death Greenwood, Barrow, and Penry, for being *Brownists*. Southwell, a Catholic, was racked ten times during the reign of this sister of bloody Queen Mary. In 1592, Mrs. Ward was hanged, drawn, and quartered, for assisting a Catholic priest to escape in a box. Mrs. Lyne suffered the same punishment for harbouring a priest; and in 1586, Mrs. Clitheroe, who was accused of relieving a priest, and refused to plead, was pressed to death in York Castle; a sharp stone being placed underneath her back.

Have not Protestants persecuted both Catholics and their fellow Protestants in Germany, Switzerland, Geneva, France, Holland, Sweden, and England? Look to the atrocious punishment of Leighton, under Laud, for writing against prelacy: first his ear was cut off, then his nose slit; then the other ear cut off, then whipped, then whipped again. Look to the horrible cruelties exercised by the Protestant Episcopalians on the Scottish Presbyterians, in the reign of Charles II., of whom 8000 are said to have perished in that persecution. Persecutions of Protestants by Protestants, are amply detailed by Chandler, in his History of Persecution; by Neale, in his History of the Puritans; by Laing, in his History of Scotland; by Penn, in his Life of Fox; and in Brandt's History of the Reformation in the Low Countries; which furnishes many very terrible cases of the sufferings of the Anabaptists and Remonstrants. In

* The total number of sufferers in the reign of Queen Mary, varies, I believe, from 200 in the Catholic to 280 in the Protestant accounts. I recommend all young men who wish to form some notion of what answer the Catholics have to make, to read Milner's "Letters to a Prebendary," and to follow the line of reading to which his references lead. They will then learn the importance of that sacred maxim, *Audi alteram partem*.

1560, the parliament of Scotland decreed, at one and the same time, the establishment of Calvinism, and the punishment of death against the ancient religion: "With such indecent haste (says Robertson) did the very persons who had just escaped ecclesiastical tyranny, proceed to imitate their example." Nothing can be so absurd as to suppose, that in barbarous ages the excesses were all committed by one religious party, and none by the other. The Huguenots of France burnt churches and hung priests wherever they found them. Froumenteau, one of their own writers, confesses, that in the single province of Dauphiny they killed two hundred and twenty priests, and one hundred and twelve friars. In the Low Countries, wherever Vandemerk, and Sonoi, lieutenants of the Prince of Orange, carried their arms, they uniformly put to death, and in cold blood, all the priests and religious they could lay their hands on. The Protestant Servetus was put to death by the Protestants of Geneva, for denying the doctrine of the Trinity, as the Protestant Gentilis was, on the same score, by those of Berne; add to these, Felix Mans, Rotman, and Barnevald. Of Servetus, Melanchthon, the mildest of men, declared that he deserved to have his bowels pulled out, and his body torn to pieces. The last fires of persecution which were lighted in England, were by Protestants. Bartholomew Legate, an Arian, was burnt by order of King James in Smithfield, on the 18th of March, 1612; on the 11th of April, in the same year, Edward Weightman was burnt at Lichfield, by order of the Protestant Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry; and this man was, *I believe*, the last person who was burnt in England for heresy. There was another condemned to the fire for the same heresy, but, as pity was excited by the constancy of these sufferers, it was thought better to allow him to linger on a miserable life in Newgate. Fuller, who wrote in the reign of Charles II., and was a zealous Church of England man, speaking of the burnings in question, says, "It may appear that God was well pleased with them."

There are, however, grievous faults on both sides: and as there are a set of men, who, not content with retaliating upon Protestants, deny the persecuting spirit of the Catholics, I would ask them what they think of the following code, drawn up by the French Catholics against the French Protestants, and carried into execution for one hundred years, and as late as the year 1765, and not repealed till 1782.

"Any Protestant clergyman remaining in France three days, without coming to the Catholic worship, to be punished with death. If a Protestant sends his son to a Protestant schoolmaster for education, he is to forfeit 250 livres a month, and the schoolmaster who receives him, 50 livres. If they sent their children to any seminary abroad, they were to forfeit 2000 livres, and the child so sent became incapable of possessing property in France. To celebrate Protestant worship, exposed the clergyman to a fine of 2800 livres. The fine for a Protestant for hearing it, was 1300 livres. If any Protestant denied the authority of the Pope in France, his goods were seized for the first offence, and he was hanged for the second. If any Common Prayer-book, or book of Protestant worship, be found in the possession of any Protestant, he shall forfeit 20 livres for the first offence, 40 livres for the second, and shall be imprisoned at pleasure for the third. Any person bringing from beyond sea, or selling, any Protestant books of worship, to forfeit 100 livres. Any magistrates may search Protestant houses for such articles. Any person, required by a magistrate to take an oath against the Protestant religion, and refusing, to be committed to prison, and if he afterwards refuse again, to suffer forfeiture of goods. Any person, sending any money over sea to the support of a Protestant seminary, to forfeit his goods, and be imprisoned at the king's pleasure. Any person going over sea, for Protestant education, to forfeit goods and lands for life. The vessel to be forfeited which conveyed any Protestant woman or child over sea, without the king's licence. Any person converting another to the Pro-

testant religion, to be put to death. Death to any Protestant priest to come into France; death to the person who receives him; forfeiture of goods and imprisonment to send money for the relief of any Protestant clergyman: large rewards for discovering a Protestant parson. Every Protestant shall cause his child, within one month after birth, to be baptized by a Catholic priest, under a penalty of 2000 livres. Protestants were fined 4000 livres a month for being absent from Catholic worship, were disabled from holding offices and employments, from keeping arms in their houses, from maintaining suits at law, from being guardians, from practising in law or physic, and from holding offices, civil or military. They were forbidden (bravo, Louis XIV.!) to travel more than five miles from home without licence, under pain of forfeiting all their goods, and they might not come to court under pain of 2000 livres A married Protestant woman, when convicted of being of that persuasion, was liable to forfeit two thirds of her jointure; she could not be executrix to her husband, nor have any part of his goods; and during her marriage she might be kept in prison, unless her husband redeemed her at the rate of 200 livres a month, or the third part of his lands. Protestants convicted of being such, were, within three months after their conviction, either to submit, and renounce their religion, or, if required by four magistrates, to abjure the realm, and if they did not depart, or departing returned, were to suffer death. All Protestants were required, under the most tremendous penalties, to swear that they considered the Pope as the head of the Church. If they refused to take this oath, which might be tendered at pleasure by any two magistrates, they could not act as advocates, procureurs, or notaries public. Any Protestant taking any office, civil or military, was compelled to abjure the Protestant religion; to declare his belief in the doctrine of transubstantiation, and to take the Roman Catholic sacrament within six months, under the penalty of 10,000 livres. Any person professing the Protestant religion, and educated in the same, was required, in six months after the age of sixteen, to declare the Pope to be the head of the Church; to declare his belief in transubstantiation, and that the invocation of saints was according to the doctrine of the Christian religion; failing this, he could not hold, possess, or inherit landed property; his lands were given to the nearest Catholic relation. Many taxes were doubled upon Protestants. Protestants keeping schools were imprisoned for life, and all Protestants were forbidden to come within ten miles of Paris or Versailles. If any Protestant had a horse worth more than 100 livres, any Catholic magistrate might take it away, and search the house of the said Protestant for arms." Is not this a monstrous code of persecution? Is it any wonder, after reading such a spirit of tyranny as is here exhibited, that the tendencies of the Catholic religion should be suspected, and that the cry of No Popery should be a rallying sign to every Protestant nation in Europe? . . . . . Forgive, gentle reader, and gentle elector, the trifling deception I have practised upon you. This code is not a code made by French Catholics against French Protestants, but by English and Irish Protestants against English and Irish Catholics; I have given it to you, for the most part, as it is set forth in Burn's "Justice," of 1780: it was acted upon in the beginning of the last king's reign, and was notorious through the whole of Europe, as the most cruel and atrocious system of persecution ever instituted by one religious persuasion against another. Of this code Mr. Burke says, that "it is a truly barbarous system; where all the parts are an outrage on the laws of humanity, and the rights of nature; it is a system of elaborate contrivance, as well fitted for the oppression, imprisonment, and degradation of a people, and the debasement of human nature itself, as ever proceeded from the perverted ingenuity of man." It is in vain to say that these cruelties were laws of political safety; such has always been the plea for all religious cruelties; by such

arguments the Catholics defended the massacre of St. Bartholomew, and the burnings of Mary.

With such facts as these, the cry of persecution will not do; it is unwise to make it, because it can be so very easily, and so very justly retorted. The business is, to forget and forgive, to kiss and be friends, and to say nothing of what has passed; which is to the credit of neither party. There have been atrocious cruelties, and abominable acts of injustice, on both sides. It is not worth while to contend who shed the most blood, or whether (as Dr. Sturgess objects to Dr. Milner) death by fire is worse than hanging or starving in prison. As far as England itself is concerned, the balance may be better preserved. Cruelties exercised upon the Irish go for nothing in English reasoning; but if it were not uncandid and vexatious to consider Irish persecutions* as part of the case, I firmly believe there have been two Catholics put to death for religious causes in Great Britain for one Protestant who has suffered: not that this proves much, because the Catholics have enjoyed the sovereign power for so few years between this period and the Reformation; and certainly it must be allowed that they were not inactive, during that period, in the great work of pious combustion.

It is however some extenuation of the Catholic excesses, that their religion was the religion of the whole of Europe when the innovation began. They were the ancient lords and masters of faith, before men introduced the practice of thinking for themselves in these matters. The Protestants have less excuse, who claimed the right of innovation, and then turned round upon other Protestants who acted upon the same principle, or upon Catholics who remained as they were, and visited them with all the cruelties from which they had themselves so recently escaped.

Both sides, as they acquired power, abused it; and both learnt, from their sufferings, the great secret of toleration and forbearance. If you wish to do good in the times in which you live, contribute your efforts to perfect this grand work. I have not the most distant intention to interfere in local politics; but I advise you never to give a vote to any man whose only title for asking it is, that he means to continue the punishments, privations, and incapacities of any human beings, merely because they worship God in the way they think best: the man who asks for your vote upon such a plea, is, *probably*, a very weak man, who believes in his own bad reasoning, or a very artful man, who is laughing at you for your credulity: at all events, he is a man who knowingly or unknowingly exposes his country to the greatest dangers, and hands down to posterity all the foolish opinions and all the bad passions which prevail in those times in which he happens to live. Such a man is so far from being that friend to the Church which he pretends to be, that he declares its safety cannot be reconciled with the franchises of the people; for what worse can be said of the Church of England than this, that wherever it is judged necessary to give it a legal establishment, it becomes necessary to deprive the body of the people, if they adhere to their old opinions, of their liberties, and of all their free customs, and to reduce them to a state of civil servitude?

SYDNEY SMITH.

* Thurloe writes to Henry Cromwell to *catch* up some thousand Irish boys, to send to the colonies. Henry writes back he has done so; and desires to know whether his Highness would choose as many girls to be caught up: and he adds, "doubtless it is a business in which God will appear." Suppose *bloody Queen Mary* had caught up and transported three or four thousand Protestant boys and girls from the three Ridings of Yorkshire!!!!!!

A SERMON

ON THOSE

RULES OF CHRISTIAN CHARITY

BY WHICH

OUR OPINIONS OF OTHER SECTS SHOULD BE FORMED:

PREACHED BEFORE THE

MAYOR AND CORPORATION

IN

THE CATHEDRAL CHURCH OF BRISTOL

On Wednesday, Nov. 5, 1828.

I PUBLISH this Sermon (or rather allow others to publish it), because many persons, who know the city of Bristol better than I do, have earnestly solicited me to do so, and are convinced it will do good. It is not without reluctance (as far as I myself am concerned) that I send to the Press such plain rudiments of common charity and common sense.

SYDNEY SMITH.

Nov. 8, 1828.

COL. III. 12, 13.

Put on, as the elect of God, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, long-suffering; forbearing one another, and forgiving one another.

THE Church of England, in its wisdom and piety, has very properly ordained that a day of thanksgiving should be set apart, in which we may return thanks to Almighty God, for the mercies vouchsafed to this nation in their escape from the dreadful plot planned for the destruction of the Sovereign and his Parliament,—the forerunner, no doubt, of such sanguinary scenes as were suited to the manners of that age, and must have proved the inevitable consequence of such enormous wickedness and cruelty. Such an escape is a fair and lawful foundation for national piety. And it is a comely and Christian sight to see the magistrates and high authorities of the land obedient to the ordinances of the Church, and holding forth to their fellow-subjects a wise example of national gratitude and serious devotion. This use of this day is deserving of every commendation. The idea that Almighty God does sometimes exercise a special providence for the preservation of a whole people is justified by Scripture, is not repugnant to reason, and can produce nothing but feelings and opinions favourable to virtue and religion.

Another wise and lawful use of this day is an honest self-congratulation that we have burst through those bands which the Roman Catholic priesthood would impose upon human

judgment; that the Protestant Church not only permits, but exhorts, every man to appeal from human authority to the Scriptures; that it makes of the clergy guides and advisers, not masters and oracles; that it discourages vain and idle ceremonies, unmeaning observances, and hypocritical pomp; and encourages freedom in thinking upon religion, and simplicity in religious forms. It is impossible that any candid man should not observe the marked superiority of the Protestant over the Catholic faith in these particulars; and difficult that any pious man should not feel grateful to Almighty Providence for escape from danger which would have plunged this country afresh into so many errors and so many absurdities.

I hope, in this condemnation of the Catholic religion (in which I most sincerely join its bitterest enemies), I shall not be so far mistaken as to have it supposed that I would convey the slightest approbation of any laws which disqualify or incapacitate any class of men from civil offices on account of religious opinions. I regard all such laws as fatal and lamentable mistakes in legislation; they are mistakes of troubled times and half-barbarous ages. All Europe is gradually emerging from their influence. This country has lately, with the entire consent of its Prelates, made a noble and successful effort, by the abolition of some of the most obnoxious laws of this class. In proportion as such example is followed, the enemies of Church and State will be diminished, and the foundation of peace, order, and happiness be strengthened. These are my opinions, which I mention, not to convert you, but to guard myself from misrepresentation. It is my duty, — it is my wish, — it is the subject of this day to point out those evils of the Catholic religion from which we have escaped; but I should be to the last degree concerned, if a condemnation of theological errors were to be construed into an approbation of laws which I cannot but consider as deeply marked by a spirit of intolerance. I therefore beg you to remember, that I record these opinions, not for the purpose of converting any one to them, which would be an abuse of the privilege of addressing you from the pulpit; not that I attach the slightest degree of importance to them because they are mine; but merely to guard myself from misrepresentation upon a point on which all men's passions are, at this moment, so powerfully excited.

I have said that, at this moment, all men's passions are powerfully excited on this subject. If this be true, it points out to me my line of duty. I must use my endeavours to guard against the abuse of this day; to take care that the principles of sound reason are not lost sight of; and that such excitement, instead of rising into dangerous vehemence, is calmed into active and useful investigation on the subject.

I shall, therefore, on the present occasion, not investigate generally the duties of charity and forbearance, but of charity and forbearance in religious matters; of that Christian meekness and humility which prevent the intrusion of bad passions into religious concerns, and keep calm and pure the mind intent upon eternity. And remember, I beg of you, that the rules I shall offer you for the observation of Christian charity are general, and of universal application. What you choose to do, and which way you incline upon any particular question, are, and can be, no concern of mine. It would be the height of arrogance and presumption in me, or in any other minister of God's word, to interfere on such points; I only endeavour to teach that spirit of forbearance and charity, which (though it cannot always prevent differences upon religious points) will ensure that these differences are carried on with Christian gentleness. I have endeavoured to lay down these rules for difference with care and moderation; and if you will attend to them patiently I think you will agree with me, that however the practice of them may be forgotten, the propriety of them cannot be denied.

It would always be easier to fall in

with human passions than to resist them; but the ministers of God must do their duty through evil report, and through good report; neither prevented nor excited by the interests of the present day. They must teach those general truths which the Christian religion has committed to their care, and upon which the happiness and peace of the world depend.

In pressing upon you the great duty of religious charity, the inutility of the opposite defect of religious violence first offers itself to, and indeed obtrudes itself upon, my notice. The evil of difference of opinion must exist; it admits of no cure. The wildest visionary does not now hope he can bring his fellow-creatures to one standard of faith. If history has taught us any one thing, it is that mankind, on such sort of subjects, will form their own opinions. Therefore to want charity in religious matters is at least useless; it hardens error, and provokes recrimination: but it does not enlighten those whom we wish to reclaim, nor does it extend doctrines which to us appear so clear and indisputable. But to do wrong, and to gain nothing by it, is surely to add folly to fault, and to proclaim an understanding not led by the rule of reason, as well as a disposition unregulated by the Christian faith.

Religious charity requires that we should not judge any sect of Christians by the representations of their enemies alone, without hearing and reading what they have to say in their own defence; it requires only, of course, to state such a rule to procure for it general admission. No man can pretend to say that such a rule is not founded upon the plainest principles of justice —upon those plain principles of justice which no one thinks of violating in the ordinary concerns of life; and yet I fear that rule is not always very strictly adhered to in religious animosities. Religious hatred is often founded on tradition, often on hearsay, often on the misrepresentations of notorious enemies; without inquiry, without the slightest examination of opposite reasons and authorities, or consideration of that which the accused party has to offer for defence or explanation. It is impossible, I admit, to examine everything; many have not talents, many have not leisure, for such pursuits; many must be contented with the faith in which they have been brought up, and must think it the best modification of the Christian faith, because they are told it is so. But this imperfect acquaintance with religious controversy, though not blameable when it proceeds from want of power, and want of opportunity, can be no possible justification of violent and acrimonious opinions. I would say to the ignorant man, "It is not your ignorance I blame; you have had no means perhaps of acquiring knowledge: the circumstances of your life have not led to it—may have prevented it; but then I must tell you, if you have not had leisure to inquire, you have no right to accuse. If you are unacquainted with the opposite arguments, —or, knowing, cannot balance them, it is not upon you the task devolves of exposing the errors, and impugning the opinions of other sects." If charity be ever necessary, it is in those who know accurately neither the accusation nor the defence. If invectives, —if rooted antipathy, in religious opinions be ever a breach of Christian rules, it is so in those who, not being able to become wise, are not willing to become charitable and modest.

Any candid man acquainted with religious controversy will, I think, admit that he has frequently, in the course of his studies, been astonished by the force of arguments with which that cause has been defended which he at first thought to be incapable of any defence at all. Some accusations he has found to be utterly groundless; in others the facts and arguments have been mis-stated: in other instances the accusation has been retorted: in many cases the tenets have been defended by strong arguments and honest appeal to Scripture, in many with consummate acuteness and deep learning. So that religious studies often teach to opponents a greater respect for each other's talents, motives, and acquirements;

exhibit the real difficulties of the subject; lessen the surprise and anger which are apt to be excited by opposition; and by these means, promote that forgiving one another, and forbearing one another, which are so powerfully recommended by the words of my text.

A great deal of mischief is done by not attending to the limits of interference with each other's religious opinions,—by not leaving to the power and wisdom of God, that which belongs to God alone. Our holy religion consists of some doctrines which influence practice, and of others which are purely speculative. If religious errors be of the former description, they may, perhaps, be fair objects of human interference; but if the opinion be merely theological and speculative, there, the right of human interference seems to end, because the necessity for such interference does not exist. Any error of this nature is between the Creator and the creature,—between the Redeemer and the redeemed. If such opinions are not the best opinions which can be found, God Almighty will punish the error, if mere error seemeth to the Almighty a fit object of punishment. Why may not man wait if God waits? Where are we called upon in Scripture to pursue men for errors purely speculative?—to assist Heaven in punishing those offences which belong only to Heaven?—in fighting unasked for what we deem to be the battles of God,—of that patient and merciful God, who pities the frailties we do not pity,—who forgives the errors we do not forgive, —who sends rain upon the just and the unjust, and maketh his sun to shine upon the evil and the good.

Another canon of religious charity is to revise, at long intervals, the bad opinions we have been compelled, or rather our forefathers have been compelled, to form of other Christian sects; to see whether the different bias of the age, the more general diffusion of intelligence, do not render those tenets less pernicious: that which might prove a very great evil under other circumstances, and in other times, may, perhaps, however weak and erroneous, be harmless in these times, and under these circumstances. We must be aware, too, that we do not mistake recollections for apprehensions, and confound together what has passed with what is to come,—history with futurity. For instance, it would be the most enormous abuse of this religious institution to imagine that such dreadful scenes of wickedness are to be apprehended from the Catholics of the present day, because the annals of this country were disgraced by such an event two hundred years ago. It would be an enormous abuse of this day to extend the crimes of a few desperate wretches to a whole sect; to fix the passions of dark ages upon times of refinement and civilisation. All these are mistakes and abuses of this day, which violate every principle of Christian charity, endanger the peace of society, and give life and perpetuity to hatreds, which must perish at one time or another, and had better, for the peace of society, perish now.

It would be religiously charitable also, to consider whether the objectionable tenets, which different sects profess, are in their hearts as well as in their books. There is unfortunately so much pride where there ought to be so much humility, that it is difficult, if not almost impossible, to make religious sects abjure or recant the doctrines they have once professed. It is not in this manner, I fear, that the best and purest churches are ever reformed. But the doctrine gradually becomes obsolete; and, though not disowned, ceases in fact to be a distinguishing characteristic of the sect which professes it. These modes of reformation, —this silent antiquation of doctrines,— this real improvement, which the parties themselves are too wise not to feel, though not wise enough to own, must, I am afraid, be generally conceded to human infirmity. They are indulgences not unnecessary to many sects of Christians. The more generous method would be to admit error where error exists, to say these were the tenets and interpretations of dark and ignorant ages; wider inquiry, fresh discussion, superior intelligence have convinced

us we are wrong; we will act in future upon better and wiser principles. This is what men do in laws, arts, and sciences; and happy for them would it be if they used the same modest docility in the highest of all concerns. But it is, I fear, more than experience will allow us to expect; and therefore the kindest and most charitable method is to allow religious sects silently to improve without reminding them of, and taunting them with, the improvement; without bringing them to the humiliation of formal disavowal, or the still more pernicious practice of defending what they know to be indefensible. The triumphs which proceed from the neglect of these principles are not (what they pretend to be) the triumphs of religion, but the triumphs of personal vanity. The object is not to extinguish dangerous error with as little pain and degradation as possible to him who has fallen into the error: but the object is to exalt ourselves, and to depreciate our theological opponents, as much as possible, at any expense to God's service, and to the real interests of truth and religion.

There is another practice not less common than this, and equally uncharitable; and that is, to represent the opinions of the most violent and eager persons who can be met with, as the common and received opinions of the whole sect. There are, in every denomination of Christians, individuals, by whose opinion or by whose conduct the great body would very reluctantly be judged. Some men aim at attracting notice by singularity; some are deficient in temper; some in learning; some push every principle to the extreme; distort, overstate, pervert; fill every one to whom their cause is dear with concern that it should have been committed to such rash and intemperate advocates. If you wish to gain a victory over your antagonists, these are the men whose writings you should study, whose opinions you should dwell on, and should carefully bring forward to notice; but if you wish, as the elect of God, to put on kindness and humbleness, meekness, and long-suffering,—if you wish to forbear and to forgive, it will then occur to you that you should seek the true opinions of any sect from those only who are approved of, and reverenced by that sect; to whose authority that sect defer, and by whose arguments they consider their tenets to be properly defended. This may not suit your purpose if you are combating for victory; but it is your duty if you are combating for truth; it is the safe, honest, and splendid conduct of him, who never writes nor speaks on religious subjects, but that he may diffuse the real blessings of religion among his fellow-creatures, and restrain the bitterness of controversy by the feelings of Christian charity and forbearance.

Let us also ask ourselves, when we are sitting in severe judgment upon the faults, follies, and errors of other Christian sects, whether it be not barely possible that we have fallen into some mistakes and misrepresentations? Let us ask ourselves, honestly and fairly, whether we are wholly exempt from prejudice, from pride, from obstinate adhesion to what candour calls upon us to alter, and to yield? Are there no violent and mistaken members of our own community, by whose conduct we should be loth to be guided,—by whose tenets we should not choose our faith should be judged? Has time, that improves all, found nothing in us to change for the better? Amid all the manifold divisions of the Christian world, are we the only Christians who, without having anything to learn from the knowledge and civilisation of the last three centuries, have started up, without infancy, and without error, into consummate wisdom and spotless perfection?

To listen to enemies as well as friends is a rule which not only increases sense in common life, but is highly favourable to the increase of religious candour. You find that you are not so free from faults as your friends suppose, nor so full of faults as your enemies suppose. You begin to think it not impossible that you may be as unjust to others as they are to you; and that the wisest and most Christian scheme is that of

mutual indulgence; that it is better to put on, as the elect of God, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, long-suffering, forbearing one another, and forgiving one another.

Some men cannot understand how they are to be zealous if they are candid in religious matters; how the energy, necessary for the one virtue, is compatible with the calmness which the other requires. But remember that the Scriptures carefully distinguish between laudable zeal and indiscreet zeal; that the apostles and epistolary writers knew they had as much to fear from the over-excitement of some men, as from the supineness of others; and in nothing have they laboured more than in preventing religion from arming human passions, instead of allaying them, and rendering those principles a source of mutual jealousy and hatred which were intended for universal peace. I admit that indifference sometimes puts on the appearance of candour; but though there is a counterfeit, yet there is a reality; and the imitation proves the value of the original, because men only attempt to multiply the appearances of useful and important things. The object is to be at the same time pious to God and charitable to man; to render your own faith as pure and perfect as possible, not only without hatred of those who differ from you, but with a constant recollection that it is possible, in spite of thought and study, that you may have been mistaken,—that other sects may be right,—and that a zeal in his service, which God does not want, is a very bad excuse for those bad passions which his sacred word condemns.

Lastly, I would suggest that many differences between sects are of less importance than the furious zeal of many men would make them. Are the tenets of any sect of such a description that we believe they will be saved under the Christian faith? Do they fulfil the common duties of life? Do they respect property? Are they obedient to the laws? Do they speak the truth? If all these things be right, the violence of hostility may surely submit to some little softness and relaxation; honest difference of opinion cannot fall for such entire separation and complete antipathy; such zeal as this, if it *be* zeal, and not something worse, is not surely zeal according to discretion.

The arguments, then, which I have adduced in support of the great principles of religious charity are, that violence upon such subjects is rarely or ever found to be useful; but generally to produce effects opposite to those which are intended. I have observed that religious sects are not to be judged from the representations of their enemies? but that they are to be heard for themselves, in the pleadings of their best writers, not in the representations of those whose intemperate zeal is a misfortune to the sect to which they belong. If you will study the principles of your religious opponents, you will often find your contempt and hatred lessened in proportion as you are better acquainted with what you despise. Many religious opinions, which are purely speculative, are without the limits of human interference. In the numerous sects of Christianity, interpreting our religion in very opposite manners, all cannot be right. Imitate the forbearance and long-suffering of God, who throws the mantle of his mercy over all, and who will probably save, on the last day, the piously right and the piously wrong, seeking Jesus in humbleness of mind. Do not drive religious sects to the disgrace (or to what they foolishly think the disgrace) of formally disavowing tenets they once professed, but concede something to human weakness; and when the tenet is virtually given up, treat it as if it were actually given up; and always consider it to be very possible that you yourself may have made mistakes, and fallen into erroneous opinions, as well as any other sect to which you are opposed. If you put on these dispositions, and this tenor of mind, you cannot be guilty of any religious fault, take what part you will in the religious disputes which appear to be coming on the world. If you choose to perpetuate the restrictions

upon your fellow-creatures, no one has a right to call you bigoted; if you choose to do them away, no one has any right to call you lax and indifferent: you have done your utmost to do right, and whether you err, or do not err, in your mode of interpreting the Christian religion, you show at least that you have caught its heavenly spirit,—that you have put on, as the elect of God, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, long-suffering, forbearing one another, and forgiving one another.

I have thus endeavoured to lay before you the uses and abuses of this day; and, having stated the great mercy of God's interference, and the blessings this country has secured to itself in resisting the errors and follies, and superstitions of the Catholic Church, I have endeavoured that this just sense of our own superiority should not militate against the sacred principles of Christian charity. That charity which I ask of others, I ask also for myself. I am sure I am preaching before those who will think (whether they agree with me or not) that I have spoken conscientiously, and from good motives, and from honest feelings, on a very difficult subject,—not sought for by me, but devolving upon me in the course of duty;—in which I should have been heartily ashamed of myself (as you would have been ashamed of me), if I had thought only how to flatter and please, or thought of anything but what I hope I always do think of in the pulpit,—that I am placed here by God to tell truth, and to do good.

I shall conclude my sermon (extended, I am afraid, already to an unreasonable length), by reciting to you a very short and beautiful apologue, taken from the Rabbinical writers. It is, I believe, quoted by Bishop Taylor in his "Holy Living and Dying." I have not now access to that book, but I quote it to you from memory, and should be made truly happy if you would quote it to others from memory also.

"As Abraham was sitting in the door of his tent, there came unto him a wayfaring man; and Abraham gave him water for his feet, and set bread before him. And Abraham said unto him, 'Let us now worship the Lord our God before we eat of this bread.' And the wayfaring man said unto Abraham, 'I will not worship the Lord thy God, for thy God is not my God; but I will worship my God, even the God of my fathers.' But Abraham was exceeding wroth; and he rose up to put the wayfaring man forth from the door of his tent. And the voice of the Lord was heard in the tent,—Abraham! Abraham! have I borne with this man for threescore and ten years, and canst not thou bear with him for one hour?"*

* This beautiful Apologue is introduced by Bishop Taylor in the second edition of his 'Liberty of Prophesying. (See Bishop Heber's Life of Bishop Taylor, vol. viii. p. 232.)

Bishop Taylor says, "I end with a story which I find in the *Jew's Books*." [The story is almost word for word a translation from the Persian poet, Saadi, in his poem of the Bûstan; translated into Latin by George Gentius, a *Jew*, and published by him at Amsterdam in 1651. Taylor's *first* edition of the Liberty of Prophesying was previous to that date; his *second* edition was soon *after* it.]

Bishop Taylor adds, "Upon this (saith the story) Abraham fetched him back again, and gave him hospital entertainment and wise instruction." "Go thou," says Bishop Taylor, "and do likewise, and thy charity will be rewarded by the God of Abraham!" The original of Saadi ends with the reprimand of the Almighty. Gentius has added the subsequent sentence.

The Persian poet, Saadi, was born at Shiraz, A. H. 571 (A. D. 1193). He died at Shiraz, A. H. 691 (A. D. 1313), aged 120 years.

SERMON

ON THE

DUTIES OF THE QUEEN.

[Preached at St. Paul's Cathedral.]

DANIEL, IV. 31.

O king, thy kingdom is departed from thee.

I DO not think I am getting out of the fair line of duty of a Minister of the Gospel, if, at the beginning of a new reign, I take a short review of the moral and religious state of the country; and point out what those topics are which deserve the most serious consideration of a wise and a Christian people.

The death of a King is always an awful lesson to mankind; and it produces a more solemn pause, and creates more profound reflection, than the best lessons of the best teachers.

From the throne to the tomb — wealth, splendour, flattery, all gone! The look of favour — the voice of power, no more; — the deserted palace — the wretched monarch on his funeral bier — the mourners ready — the dismal march of death prepared. Who are we, and what are we? and for what has God made us? and why are we doomed to this frail and unquiet existence? Who does not feel all this? in whose heart does it not provoke appeal to, and dependence on God? before whose eyes does it not bring the folly and the nothingness of all things human?

But a good King must not go to his grave without that reverence from the people which his virtues deserved. And I will state to you what those virtues were,— state it to you honestly and fairly; for I should heartily despise myself, if from this chair of truth I could utter one word of panegyric of the great men of the earth, which I could not aver before the throne of God.

The late Monarch, whose loss we have to deplore, was sincere and honest in his political relations; he put his trust really where he put his trust ostensibly — and did not attempt to undermine, by secret means, those to whom he trusted publicly the conduct of affairs; and I must beg to remind you that no vice and no virtue are indifferent in a Monarch: human beings are very imitative; there is a fashion in the higher qualities of our minds, as there is in the lesser considerations of life. It is by no means indifferent to the morals of the people at large, whether a tricking perfidious king is placed on the throne of these realms, or whether the sceptre is swayed by one of plain and manly character, walking ever in a straight line, on the firm ground of truth, under the searching eye of God.

The late King was of a sweet and Christian disposition: he did not treasure up little animosities, and indulge in vindictive feelings: he had no ene-

mies but the enemies of the country; he did not make the memory of a King a fountain of wrath; the feelings of the individual (where they required any control) were in perfect subjection to the just conception he had formed of his high duties; and every one near him found it was a government of principle, and not of temper; not of caprice, not of malice couching in high places, and watching an opportunity of springing on its victim.

Our late Monarch had the good nature of Christianity: he loved the happiness of all the individuals about him, and never lost an opportunity of promoting it; and where the heart is good, and the mind active, and the means ample, this makes a luminous and beautiful life, which gladdens the nations, and leads them, and turns men to the exercise of virtue, and the great work of salvation.

We may honestly say of our late Sovereign that he loved his country, and was sensibly alive to its glory and its happiness. When he entered into his palaces he did not say, "All this is my birthright: I am entitled to it — it is my due — how can I gain more splendour? how can I increase all the pleasures of the senses?" but he looked upon it all as a memorial that he was to repay by example, by attention, and by watchfulness over the public interests, the affectionate and lavish expenditure of his subjects; and this was not a decision of reason, but a feeling which hurried him away. Whenever it was pointed out to him that England could be made more rich, or more happy, or rise higher in the scale of nations, or be better guided in the straight path of the Christian faith, on all such occasions he rose above himself; there was a warmth, and a truth, and an honesty, which it was impossible to mistake; the gates of his heart were flung open, and that heart throbbed and beat for the land which his ancestors had rescued from slavery, and governed with justice: — but he is gone — and let fools praise conquerors, and say the great Napoleon pulled down this kingdom, and destroyed that army; *we* will thank God for a King who has derived his quiet glory from the peace of his realm, and who has founded his own happiness upon the happiness of his people.

But the world passes on, and a new order of things arises. Let us take a short view of those duties which devolve upon the young Queen whom Providence has placed over us — what ideas she ought to form of her duties — and on what points she should endeavour to place the glories of her reign.

First and foremost, I think, the new Queen should bend her mind to the very serious consideration of educating the people. Of the importance of this I think no reasonable doubt can exist; it does not in its effects keep pace with the exaggerated expectations of its injudicious advocates; but it presents the best chance of national improvement.

Reading and writing are mere increase of power. They may be turned, I admit, to a good or a bad purpose; but for several years of his life the child is in your hands, and you may give to that power what bias you please: thou shalt not kill — thou shalt not steal — thou shalt not bear false witness: by how many fables, by how much poetry, by how many beautiful aids of imagination, may not the fine morality of the Sacred Scriptures be engraven on the minds of the young? I believe the arm of the assassin may be often stayed by the lessons of his early life. When I see the village school, and the tattered scholars, and the aged master or mistress teaching the mechanical art of reading or writing, and thinking that they are teaching that alone, I feel that the aged instructor is protecting life, insuring property, fencing the altar, guarding the throne, giving space and liberty to all the fine powers of man, and lifting him up to his own place in the order of Creation.

There are, I am sorry to say, many countries in Europe which have taken the lead of England in the great business of education, and it is a thoroughly commendable and legitimate object of ambition in a Sovereign to overtake

them. The names, too, of malefactors, and the nature of their crimes, are subjected to the Sovereign;—how is it possible that a Sovereign, with the fine feelings of youth, and with all the gentleness of her sex, should not ask herself, whether the human being whom she dooms to death, or at least does not rescue from death, has been properly warned in early youth of the horrors of that crime, for which his life is forfeited—"Did he ever receive any education at all?—did a father and mother watch over him—was he brought to places of worship?—was the Word of God explained to him?—was the Book of Knowledge opened to him?—Or am I, the fountain of mercy, the nursing-mother of my people, to send a forsaken wretch from the streets to the scaffold, and to prevent by unprincipled cruelty the evils of unprincipled neglect?"

Many of the objections found against the general education of the people are utterly untenable; where all are educated, education cannot be a source of distinction, and a subject for pride. The great source of labour is want; and as long as the necessities of life call for labour, labour is sure to be supplied. All these fears are foolish and imaginary; the great use and the great importance of education properly conducted is, that it creates a great bias in favour of virtue and religion, at a period of life when the mind is open to all the impressions which superior wisdom may choose to affix upon it: the sum and mass of these tendencies and inclinations make a good and virtuous people, and draw down upon us the blessing and protection of Almighty God.

A second great object, which I hope will be impressed upon the mind of this Royal Lady, is a rooted horror of war—an earnest and passionate desire to keep her people in a state of profound peace. The greatest curse which can be entailed upon mankind is a state of war. All the atrocious crimes committed in years of peace—all that is spent in peace by the secret corruptions, or by the thoughtless extravagance of nations, are mere trifles compared with the gigantic evils which stalk over the world in a state of war. God is forgotten in war—every principle of Christian charity trampled upon—human labour destroyed—human industry extinguished—you see the son, and the husband, and the brother, dying miserably in distant lands—you see the waste of human affections—you see the breaking of human hearts—you hear the shrieks of widows and children after the battle—and you walk over the mangled bodies of the wounded calling for death. I would say to that Royal child, Worship God by loving peace—it is not *your* humanity to pity a beggar by giving him food or raiment—*I* can do that; that is the charity of the humble and the unknown—widen you your heart for the more expanded miseries of mankind—pity the mothers of the peasantry who see their sons torn away from their families—pity your poor subjects crowded into hospitals, and calling in their last breath upon their distant country and their young Queen—pity the stupid, frantic folly of human beings who are always ready to tear each other to pieces, and to deluge the earth with each other's blood; this is your extended humanity—and this the great field of your compassion. Extinguish in your heart the fiendish love of military glory, from which your sex does not necessarily exempt you, and to which the wickedness of flatterers may urge you. Say upon your deathbed, "I have made few orphans in my reign—I have made few widows—my object has been peace. I have used all the weight of my character, and all the power of my situation, to check the irascible passions of mankind, and to turn them to the arts of honest industry: this has been the Christianity of my throne, and this the gospel of my sceptre; in this way I have striven to worship my Redeemer and my Judge."

I would add (if any addition were wanted as a part of the lesson to youthful royalty), the utter folly of all wars of ambition, where the object sought for—if attained at all—is

commonly attained at manifold its real value, and often wrested, after short enjoyment, from its possessor, by the combined indignation and just vengeance of the other nations of the world. It is all misery, and folly, and impiety and cruelty. The atrocities, and horrors, and disgusts of war, have never been half enough insisted upon by the teachers of the people; but the worst of evils and the greatest of follies have been varnished over with specious names, and the gigantic robbers and murderers of the world have been holden up, for their imitation, to the weak eyes of youth. May honest counsellors keep this poison from the mind of the young Queen! May she love what God bids, and do what makes men happy!

I hope the Queen will love the National Church, and protect it; but it must be impressed upon her mind, that every sect of Christians have as perfect right to the free exercise of their worship as the Church itself—that there must be no invasion of the privileges of other sects, and no contemptuous disrespect of their feelings—that the altar is the very ark and citadel of freedom.

Some persons represent old age as miserable, because it brings with it the pains and infirmities of the body; but what gratification to the mind may not old age bring with it in this country of wise and rational improvement? I have lived to see the immense improvements of the Church of England—all its powers of persecution destroyed—its monopoly of civil offices expunged from the book of the law, and all its unjust and exclusive immunities levelled to the ground. The Church of England is now a rational object of love and admiration—it is perfectly compatible with civil freedom—it is an institution for worshipping God, and not a cover for gratifying secular insolence, and ministering to secular ambition. It will be the duty of those to whom the sacred trust of instructing our youthful Queen is intrusted, to lead her attention to these great improvements in our religious establishments; and to show to her how possible, and how wise it is, to render the solid advantages of a National Church compatible with the civil rights of those who cannot assent to its doctrines.

Then again, our youthful Ruler must be very slow to believe all the exaggerated and violent abuse which religious sects indulge in against each other. She will find, for instance, that the Catholics, the great object of our horror and aversion, have (mistaken as they are) a great deal more to say in defence of their tenets than those imagine who indulge more in the luxury of invective than in the labour of inquiry—she will find in that sect, men as enlightened, talents as splendid, and probity as firm, as in our own Church: and she will soon learn to appreciate, at its just value, that exaggerated hatred of sects which paints the Catholic faith (the religion of two-thirds of Europe) as utterly incompatible with the safety, peace, and order of the world.

It will be a serious vexation to all loyal hearts, and to all rationally pious minds, if our Sovereign should fall into the common error of mistaking fanaticism for religion; and in this way fling an air of discredit upon real devotion. It is, I am afraid, unquestionably the fault of the age, her youth and her sex do not make it more improbable, and the warmest efforts of that description of persons will not be wanting to gain over a convert so illustrious, and so important. Should this take place, the consequences will be serious and distressing—the land will be inundated with hypocrisy—absurdity will be heaped upon absurdity—there will be a race of folly and extravagance for royal favour, and he who is furthest removed from reason will make the nearest approach to distinction; and then follow the usual consequences; a weariness and disgust of religion itself, and the foundation laid for an age of impiety and infidelity. Those, then, to whom these matters are delegated, will watch carefully over every sign of this excess, and guard from the mischievous intemperance of enthusiasm those feelings, and that understanding, the healthy state

of which bears so strongly and intimately upon the happiness of a whole people.

Though I deprecate the bad effects of fanaticism, I earnestly pray that our young Sovereign may evince herself to be a person of deep religious feeling: what other cure has she for all the arroganee and vanity which her exalted position must engender? for all the flattery and falsehood with which she must be surrounded? for all the soul-corrupting homage with which she is met at every moment of her existenee? what other eure than to cast herself down in darkness and solitude before God—to say that she is dust and ashes—and to call down the pity of the Almighty upon her difficult and dangerous life? This is the antidote of kings against the slavery and the baseness which surround them: they should think often of death—and the folly and nothingness of the world, and they should humble their souls before the Master of masters, and the King of kings; praying to Heaven for wisdom and ealm reflection, and for that spirit of Christian gentleness which exalts command into an empire of justiee, and turns obedience into a service of love.

A wise man struggling with adversity is said by some heathen writer to be a spectacle on which the gods might look down with pleasure: but where is there a finer moral and religious picture, or one more deserving of Divine favour, than that of which, perhaps, we are now beginning to enjoy the blessed reality?

A young Queen at that period of life which is commonly given up to frivolous amusement, sees at onee the great principles by which she should be guided, and steps at once into the great duties of her station. The importance of educating the lower orders of the people is never absent from her mind; she takes up this principle at the beginning of her life; and in all the change of servants, and in all the struggle of parties, looks to it as a source of permanent improvement. A great object of her affections is the preservation of peaee; she regards a state of war as the greatest of all human evils; thinks that the lust of conquest is not a glory, but a bad crime; despises the folly and miscalculations of war, and is willing to sacrifice everything to peace but the clear honour of her land.

The patriot Queen, whom I am painting, reverenees the National Church—frequents its worship, and regulates her faith by its precepts; but she withstands the encroachments, and keeps down the ambition natural to establishments, and by rendering the privileges of the Church compatible with the civil freedom of all seets, confers strength upon, and adds duration to, that wise and magnificent institution. And then this youthful Monarch, profoundly but wisely religious, disdaining hypocrisy, and far above the childish follies of false piety, easts herself upon God, and seeks from the Gospel of his blessed Son a path for her steps, and a comfort for her soul. Here is a picture which warms every English heart, and would bring all this congregation upon their bended knees before Almighty God to pray it may be realised. What limits to the glory and happiness of our native land, if the Creator should in his mercy have placed in the heart of this Royal Woman the rudiments of wisdom and merey; and if giving them time to expand, and to bless our children's children with her goodness. He should grant to her a long sojourning upon earth, and leave her to reign over us till she is well stricken in years! What glory! what happiness! what joy! what bounty of God! I of course can only expect to see the beginning of such a splendid period; but when I do see it, I shall exclaim with the pious Simeon,—"Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, for mine eyes have seen thy salvation."

A PRAYER.

On the Sunday after the Birth of the then Duke of Cornwall, Mr. Sydney Smith introduced the following into the Prayer used at St. Paul's Cathedral before the Sermon.

"We pray also for that Infant of the Royal Race whom in thy good Providence thou hast given us for our future King. We beseech thee so to mould his heart and fashion his spirit, that he may be a blessing and not an evil to the land of his birth. May he grow in favour with man, by leaving to its own force and direction the energy of a free People! May he grow in favour with God, by holding the Faith in Christ fervently and feelingly, without feebleness, without fanaticism, without folly! As he will be the first man in these realms, so may he be the best;—disdaining to hide bad actions by high station, and endeavouring always, by the example of a strict and moral life, to repay those gifts which a loyal people are so willing to spare from their own necessities to a good King."

FIRST LETTER

TO

ARCHDEACON SINGLETON

ON THE

ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSION.

1837.

My Dear Sir,

As you do me the honour to ask my opinion respecting the constitution and proceedings of the Ecclesiastical Commission, and of their conduct to the Dignitaries of the Church, I shall write to you without any reserve upon this subject.

The first thing which excited my surprise, was the Constitution of the Commission. As the reform was to comprehend every branch of Churchmen, Bishops, Dignitaries and Parochial Clergymen, I cannot but think it would have been much more advisable to have added to the Commission some members of the two lower orders of the Church — they would have supplied that partial knowledge which appears in so many of the proceedings of the Commissioners to have been wanting — they would have attended to those interests (not episcopal) which appear to have been so completely overlooked — and they would have screened the Commission from those charges of injustice and partiality which are now so generally brought against it. There can be no charm in the name of Bishop — the man who was a Curate yesterday is a Bishop to-day. There are many Prebendaries, many Rectors, and many Vicars, who would have come to the Reform of the Church with as much integrity, wisdom, and vigour, as any Bishop on the Bench; and, I believe, with a much stronger recollection that all the orders of the Church were not to be sacrificed to the highest; and that to make their work respectable, and lasting, it should, in all (even its minutest provisions), be founded upon justice.

All the interests of the Church in the Commutation of Tithes are entrusted to one parochial clergyman*; and I have no doubt, from what I hear of him, that they will be well protected. Why could not one or two such men have been added to the Commission, and a general impression been created, that Government in this momentous change had a parental feeling for all orders of men whose interests might be affected by it? A Ministry may laugh at this, and think if they cultivate Bishops, that they may treat the other orders of the Church with contempt and neglect; but I say, that to

* The Rev. Mr. Jones is the Commissioner appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury to watch over the interests of the Church.

create a general impression of justice, if it be not what common honesty requires from any Ministry, is what common sense points out to them. It is strength and duration — it is the only power which is worth having—in the struggle of parties it gives victory, and is remembered, and goes down to other times.

A mixture of different orders of Clergy in the Commission would at least have secured a decent attention to the representations of all; for of seven communications made to the Commission by Cathedrals, and involving very serious representations respecting high interests, six were totally disregarded, and the receipt of the papers not even acknowledged.

I cannot help thinking that the Commissioners have done a great deal too much. Reform of the Church was absolutely necessary — it cannot be avoided, and ought not to be postponed; but I would have found out what really gave offence, have applied a remedy, removed the nuisance, and done no more. I would not have operated so largely on an old, and (I fear) a decaying building. I would not, in days of such strong political excitement, and amidst such a disposition to universal change, have done one thing more than was absolutely necessary, to remove the odium against the Establishment, the only sensible reason for issuing any Commission at all; and the means which I took to effect this should have agreed as much as possible with institutions already established. For instance, the public were disgusted with the spectacle of rich Prebendaries enjoying large incomes, and doing little or nothing for them. The real remedy for this would have been to have combined wealth and labour; and as each of the present Prebendaries fell off, to have annexed the stall to some large and populous parish. A Prebendary of Canterbury or of St. Paul's, in his present state, may make the Church unpopular; but place him as Rector of a Parish, with 8000 or 9000 people, and in a Benefice of little or no value, he works for his wealth, and the odium is removed. In like manner the Prebends, which are not the property of the Residentiaries, might have been annexed to the smallest livings of the neighbourhood where the Prebendal estate was situated. The interval which has elapsed since the first furious demand for Reform would have enabled the Commissioners to adopt a scheme of much greater moderation than might perhaps have been possible at the first outbreak of popular indignation against the Church; and this sort of distribution would have given much more general satisfaction than the plan adopted by Commissioners; for though money, in the estimation of philosophers, has no ear mark, it has a very deep one in the opinion of the multitude. The riches of the Church of Durham were most hated in the neighbourhood of Durham; and there such changes as I have pointed out would have been most gladly received, and would have conciliated the greatest favour to the Church. The people of Kent cannot see why their Kentish Estates, given to the Cathedral of Canterbury, are to augment livings in Cornwall. The Citizens of London see some of their ministers starving in the city, and the profits of the extinguished Prebends sent into Northumberland. These feelings may be very unphilosophical, but they are the feelings of the mass; and to the feelings of the mass the Reforms of the Church ought to be directed. In this way the evil would have been corrected where it was most seen and noticed. All patronage would have been left as it was. One order of the Church would not have plundered the other. Nor would all the Cathedrals in England have been subjected to the unconciliating empire, and unwearied energy of one man.

Instead of this quiet and cautious mode of proceeding, all is change, fusion, and confusion. New Bishops, new Dioceses, confiscated Prebends — Clergymen changing Bishops, and Bishops Clergymen — mitres in Manchester, Gloucester turned into Bristol. Such a scene of revolution and commutation as has not been seen since the days of Ireton and Cromwell! and the singularity is, that all this has

been effected by men selected from their age, their dignity, and their known principles, and from whom the considerate part of the community expected all the caution and calmness which these high requisites seemed to promise, and ought to have secured.

The plea of making a fund is utterly untenable — the great object was not to make a fund; and there is the mistake into which the Commission have fallen: the object was not to add 10*l.* or 20*l.* per annum to a thousand small livings, and to diminish inequalities in a ratio so trifling that the public will hardly notice it; a very proper thing to do if higher interests were not sacrificed to it, but the great object was to remove the causes of hatred from the Church, by lessening such incomes as those of Canterbury, Durham, and London, exorbitantly and absurdly great — by making idleness work — and by these means to lessen the envy of laymen. It is impossible to make a fund which will raise the smaller livings of the Church into anything like a decent support for those who possess them. The whole income of the Church, episcopal, prebendal, and parochial, divided among the Clergy, would not give to each Clergyman an income equal to that which is enjoyed by the upper domestic of a great nobleman. The method in which the Church has been paid, and must continue to be paid, is by unequal divisions. All the enormous changes which the Commission is making will produce a very trifling difference in the inequality, while it will accustom more and more those enemies of the Church, who are studying under their Right Rev. Masters, to the boldest revolutions in Ecclesiastical affairs. Out of 10,478 benefices, there are 297 of about 40*l.* per annum value, 1629 at about 75*l.*, and 1602 at about 125*l.*: to raise all these benefices to 200*l.* per annum, would require an annual sum of 371,293*l.*; and upon 2878 of those benefices there are no houses; and upon 1728 no houses fit for residence. What difference in the apparent inequality of the Church would this sum of 371,293*l.* produce, if it could be raised? or in what degree would it lessen the odium which that inequality creates? The case is utterly hopeless; and yet with all their confiscations the Commissioners are so far from being able to raise the annual sum of 371,000*l.* that the utmost they expect to gain is 130,000*l.* per annum.

It seems a paradoxical statement; but the fact is, that the respectability of the Church, as well as of the Bar, is almost entirely preserved by the unequal division of their revenues. A Bar of one hundred lawyers travel the Northern Circuit, enlightening provincial ignorance, curing local partialities, diffusing knowledge, and dispensing justice in their route: it is quite certain that all they gain is not equal to all that they spend: if the profits were equally divided there would not be six and eight-pence for each person, and there would be no Bar at all. At present, the success of the leader animates them all — each man hopes to be a Scarlett or a Brougham — and takes out his ticket in a lottery by which the mass must infallibly lose, trusting (as mankind are so apt to do) to his good fortune, and believing that the prize is reserved for him — disappointment and defeat for others. So it is with the clergy; the whole income of the Church, if equally divided, would be about 250*l.* for each minister. Who would go into the Church and spend 1200*l.* or 1500*l.* upon his education, if such were the highest remuneration he could ever look to? At present, men are tempted into the Church by the prizes of the Church, and bring into that Church a great deal of capital, which enables them to live in decency, supporting themselves, not with the money of the public, but with their own money, which, but for this temptation, would have been carried into some retail trade. The offices of the Church would then fall down to men little less coarse and ignorant than agricultural labourers — the clergyman of the parish would soon be seen in the squire's kitchen; and all this would take place in a country where poverty is infamous.

In fact, nothing can be more unjust and idle than the reasoning of many laymen upon Church matters. You choose to have an Establishment — God forbid you should choose otherwise! and you wish to have men of decent manners and good education as the Ministers of that Establishment: all this is very right: but are you willing to pay them as such men ought to be paid? Are you willing to pay to each Clergyman, confining himself to one spot, and giving up all his time to the care of one parish, a salary of 500*l.* per annum? To do this would require three millions to be added to the present revennes of the Church; and such an expenditure is impossible! What then remains, if you will have a Clergy, and will not pay them equitably and separately, than to pay them unequally and by lottery? and yet this very inequality, which secures to you a respectable Clergy upon the most economical terms, is considered by laymen as a gross abuse. It is an abuse, however, which they have not the spirit to extinguish by increased munificence to their Clergy, nor justice to consider as the only other method by which all the advantages of a respectable Establishment can be procured; but they use it at the same time as a topic for sarcasm and a source of economy.

This, it will be said, is a Mammonish view of the subject: it is so, but those who make this objection forget the immense effect which Mammon produces upon religion itself. Shall the Gospel be preached by men paid by the State? shall these men be taken from the lower orders, and be meanly paid? shall they be men of learning and education? and shall there be some magnificent endowments to allure such men into the Church? Which of these methods is the best for diffusing the rational doctrines of Christianity? Not in the age of the Apostles, not in the abstract, timeless, nameless, placeless land of the philosophers, but in the year 1837, in the porter-brewing, cotton-spinning, tallow-melting kingdom of Great Britain, bursting with opulence, and flying from poverty as the greatest of human evils. Many different answers may be given to these questions; but they are questions which, not ending in Mammon, have a powerful bearing on real religion, and deserve the deepest consideration from its disciples and friends. Let the comforts of the Clergy go for nothing. Consider their state only as religion is affected by it. If upon this principle I am forced to allot to some an opulence which my clever friend the Examiner would pronounce to be unapostolical, I cannot help it; I must take this people with all their follies, and prejudices, and circumstances, and carve out an establishment best suited for them, however unfit for early Christianity in barren and conquered Judea.

Not only will this measure of the Commission bring into the Church a lower and worse educated set of men, but it will have a tendency to make the Clergy fanatical. You will have a set of ranting, raving Pastors, who will wage war against all the innocent pleasures of life, vie with each other in extravagance of zeal, and plague your heart out with their nonsense and absurdity: cribbage must be played in caverns, and sixpenny whist take refuge in the howling wilderness. In this way, low men, doomed to hopeless poverty, and galled by contempt, will endeavour to force themselves into station and significance.

There is an awkward passage in the memorial of the Church of Canterbury, which deserves some consideration from him to whom it is directed. The Archbishop of Canterbury, at his consecration, takes a solemn oath that he will maintain the rights and liberties of the Church of Canterbury; as Chairman, however, of the New Commission, he seizes the patronage of that Church, takes two-thirds of its Revenues, and abolishes two-thirds of its Members. That there is an answer to this I am very willing to believe, but I cannot at present find out what it is; and this attack upon the Revennes and Members of Canterbury is not obedience to an Act of Parliament, but the very Act of Parliament, which

takes away, is recommended, drawn up, and signed by the person who has sworn he will never take away; and this little apparent inconsistency is not confined to the Archbishop of Canterbury, but is shared equally by all the Bishop Commissioners, who have all (unless I am grievously mistaken) taken similar oaths for the preservation of their respective Chapters. It would be more easy to see our way out of this little embarrassment, if some of the embarrassed had not unfortunately, in the parliamentary debates on the Catholic Question, laid the greatest stress upon the King's oath, applauded the sanctity of the monarch to the skies, rejected all comments, called for the oath in its plain meaning, and attributed the safety of the English Church to the solemn vow made by the King at the altar to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, and the other Bishops. I should be very sorry if this were not placed on a clear footing, as fools will be imputing to our Church the *pia et religiosa Calliditas*, which is so commonly brought against the Catholics.

Urbem quam dicunt Romam, Melibœe, putavi
Stultus ego huic nostræ similem.

The words of Henry VIII., in endowing the Cathedral of Canterbury, are thus given in the translation: — "We therefore, dedicating the aforesaid close, site, circle, and precinct to the honour and glory of the Holy and undivided Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, have decreed that a certain Cathedral and Metropolitan Church, with one Dean, Presbyter, and Twelve Prebendaries Presbyters; these verily and for ever to serve Almighty God shall be created, set up, settled, and established; and the same aforesaid Cathedral and Metropolitan Church, with one Dean, Presbyter, and Twelve Prebendaries Presbyters, with other Ministers necessary for divine worship, by the tenor of these presents in reality, and plenitude of force, we do create, set up, settle, and establish, and do command to be established and to be in perpetuity, and inviolably maintained and upheld by these presents." And this is the Church, the rights and liberties of which the Archbishop at his consecration swears to maintain. Nothing can be more ill-natured among politicians, than to look back into Hansard's Debates, to see what has been said by particular men upon particular occasions, and to contrast such speeches with present opinions — and therefore I forbear to introduce some inviting passages upon taking oaths in their plain and obvious sense, both in debates on the Catholic Question and upon that fatal and *Mezentian* oath which binds the Irish to the English Church.

It is quite absurd to see how all the Cathedrals are to be trimmed to an exact *Procrustes* pattern; — *quieta movere* is the motto of the Commission: — there is to be everywhere a Dean and four Residentiaries; but St. Paul's and Lincoln have at present only three Residentiaries and a Dean, who officiates in his turn as a Canon: — a fourth must be added to each. Why? nobody wants more Prebendaries; St. Paul's and Lincoln go on very well as they are. It is not for the lack of Prebendaries, it is for idleness, that the Church of England is unpopular; but in the lust of reforming, the Commission cut and patch property as they would cut figures in pasteboard. This little piece of wanton change, however, gives to two of the Bishops, who are Commissioners as well as Bishops, patronage of a thousand a year each; and though I am willing not to consider this as the cause of the recommendation, yet I must observe it is not very common that the same persons should bring in the verdict and receive the profits of the suit. No other Archdeacons are paid in such a manner, and no other Bishops out of the Commission have received such a bonus.*

I must express my surprise that nothing in this Commission of Bishops,

* This extravagant pay of Archdeacons is taken, remember, from that fund for the augmentation of small Livings, for the establishment of which all the divisions and confiscations have been made.

either in the Bill which has passed, or in the Report which preceded it, is said of the duties of Bishops. A Bishop is not now forced by law to be in his diocese, or to attend his duty in Parliament—he may be entirely absent from both; nor are there wanting instances within these six years where such has been the case. It would have been very easy to have placed the repairs of Episcopal Palaces (as the concurrent leases of Bishops are placed) under the superintendence of Deans and Chapters; but though the Bishop's bill was accompanied by another bill, containing the strictest enactments for the residence of the Clergy, and some very arbitrary and unjust rules for the repair of their houses, it did not appear upon the face of the law that the Bishops had any such duties to perform; and yet I remember the case of a bishop, dead not six years ago, who was scarcely ever seen in the House of Lords, or in his diocese; and I remember well also the indignation with which the inhabitants of a great Cathedral town spoke of the conduct of another Bishop (now also deceased), who not only never entered his palace, but turned his horses into the garden. When I mention these instances, I am not setting myself up as the satirist of Bishops. I think, upon the whole, they do their duty in a very exemplary manner; but they are not, as the late bills would have us to suppose, *impeccable*. The Church Commissioners should not have suffered their reports and recommendations to paint the other branches of the Church as such slippery transgredient mortals, and to leave the world to imagine that Bishops may be safely trusted to their own goodness without enactment or control.

This squabble about patronage is said to be disgraceful. Those who mean to be idle, and insolent, because they are at peace, may look out of the window and say, "This is a disgraceful squabble between Bishops and Chapters;" but those who mean to be just should ask, *Who begins?* the *real* disgrace of the squabble is in the attack, and not in the defence. If any man put his hand into my pocket to take my property, am I disgraced if I prevent him? Churchmen are ready enough to be submissive to their superiors; but were they to submit to a spoliation so gross, accompanied with ignominy, and degradation, and to bear all this in submissive silence;—to be accused of Nepotism by Nepotists, who were praising themselves indirectly by the accusation, and benefiting themselves directly by the confiscation founded on it;—the real disgrace would have been to have submitted to this: and men are to be honoured, not disgraced, who come forth contrary to their usual habits, to oppose those masters, whom, in common seasons, they would willingly obey; but who, in this matter, have tarnished their dignity, and forgotten what they owe to themselves and to us.

It is a very singular thing that the law always suspects Judges, and never suspects Bishops. If there be any way in which the partialities of the Judge may injure laymen, the subject is fenced round with all sorts of jealousies, and enactments, and prohibitions—all partialities are guarded against, and all propensities watched. Where Bishops are concerned, acts of Parliament are drawn up for beings who can never possibly be polluted by pride, prejudice, passion, or interest. Not otherwise would be the case with Judges, if they, like the heads of the Church, legislated for themselves.

Then comes the question of patronage: can anything be more flagrantly unjust, than that the patronage of Cathedrals should be taken away and conferred upon the Bishops? I do not want to go into a long and tiresome history of Episcopal Nepotism; but it is notorious to all, that Bishops confer their patronage upon their sons, and sons-in-law, and all their relations; and it is really quite monstrous in the face of the world, who see this every day, and every hour, to turn round upon Deans and Chapters, and to say to them, "We are credibly informed that there are instances in your Chapters where preferment has not

been given to the most learned men you can find, but to the sons and brothers of some of the Prebendaries. These things must not be — we must ake these Benefices into our own keeping;" and this is the language of men swarming themselves with sons and daughters, and who, in enumerating the advantages of their stations, have always spoken of the opportunities of providing for their families as the greatest and most important. It is, I admit, the duty of every man, and of everybody, to present the best man that can be found to any living of which he is the Patron; but if this duty has been neglected, it has been neglected by Bishops quite as much as by Chapters; and no man can open the "Clerical Guide," and read two pages of it, without seeing that the Bench of Bishops are the last persons from whom any remedy of this evil is to be expected.

The legislature has not always taken the same view of the comparative trustworthiness of Bishops and Chapters as is taken by the Commission. Bishops' leases for years are for twenty-one years, renewable every seven. When seven years are expired, if the present tenant will not renew, the Bishop may grant a concurrent lease. How does his Lordship act on such occasions? He generally asks two years' income for the renewal, when Chapters, not having the privilege of granting such concurrent leases, ask only a year and a half; and if the Bishop's price is not given, he puts a son, or a daughter, or a trustee, into the estate, and the price of the lease deferred is money saved for his family. But unfair and exorbitant terms may be asked by his Lordship, and the tenant may be unfairly dispossessed; therefore, the legislature enacts that all those concurrent leases must be countersigned by the Dean and Chapter of the diocese — making them the safeguards against Episcopal rapacity; and, as I hear from others, not making them so in vain. These sort of laws do not exactly correspond with the relative views taken of both parties by the Ecclesiastical Commission. This view of Chapters is of course overlooked by a Commission of Bishops, just as all mention of bridles would be omitted in a meeting of horses; but in this view Chapters might be made eminently useful. In what profession, too, are there no gradations? Why is the Church of England to be nothing but a collection of Beggars and Bishops— the Right Reverend Dives in the palace, and Lazarus in orders at the gate, doctored by dogs, and comforted with crumbs?

But to take away the patronage of existing Prebendaries is objectionable for another class of reasons. If it is right to take away the patronage of my Cathedral and to give it to the Bishop, it is at least unjust to do so with my share of it during my life. Society have a right to improve, or to do what they think an improvement, but then they have no right to do so suddenly, and hastily to my prejudice! After securing to me certain possessions by one hundred statutes passed in six hundred years — after having clothed me in fine garments, and conferred upon me pompous names, they have no right to turn round upon me all of a sudden, and to say, You are not a Dean nor a Canon-Residentiary, but a vagabond and an outcast, and a morbid exerescence upon society. This would not be a reform, but the grossest tyranny and oppression. If a man cannot live under the canopy of ancient law, where is he safe? how can he see his way, or lay out his plan of life?

Dubitant homines serere atque impendere curas.

You tolerated for a century the wicked traffic in slaves, legislated for that species of property, encouraged it by premiums, defended it in your Courts of Justice—West Indians bought, and sold, trusting (as Englishmen always ought to trust) in Parliaments. Women went to the altar, promised that they should be supported by that property; and children were born to it, and young men were educated with it: but God touched the hearts of the English people, and they would have no slaves. The scales fell from their eyes, and they saw the monstrous wickedness of the

traffic; but then they said, and said magnificently, to the West Indians, "We mean to become wiser and better, but not at your expense; the loss shall be ours, and we will not involve you in ruin, because we are ashamed of our former cruelties, and have learnt a better lesson of humanity and wisdom." And this is the way in which improving nations ought to act, and this is the distinction between reform and revolution.

Justice is not changed by the magnitude or minuteness of the subject. The old Cathedrals have enjoyed their patronage for seven hundred years, and the new ones since the time of Henry VIII.; which latter period even gives a much longer possession than ninety-nine out of a hundred of the legislators, who are called upon to plunder us, can boast of for their own estates. And these rights, thus sanctioned, and hallowed by time, are torn from their present possessors without the least warning or preparation, in the midst of all that fever of change which has seized upon the people, and which frightens men to the core of their hearts; and this spoliation is made, not by low men rushing into the plunder of the Church and State, but by men of admirable and unimpeached character in all the relations of life — not by rash men of new politics, but by the ancient conservators of ancient law — by the Archbishops and Bishops of the land, high official men, invented and created, and put in palaces to curb the lawless changes and the mutations, and the madness of mankind; and, to crown the whole, the ludicrous is added to the unjust, and what they take from the other branches of the Church they confer upon *themselves*.

Never dreaming of such sudden revolutions as these, a Prebendary brings up his son to the Church, and spends a large sum of money in his education, which perhaps he can ill afford. His hope is (wicked wretch!) that according to the established custom of the body to which he (immoral man!) belongs, the chapter will (when his turn arrives), if his son be of fair attainments and good character, attend to his nefarious recommendation, and confer the living upon the young man; and in an instant all his hopes are destroyed, and he finds his preferment seized upon, under the plea of public good, by a stronger churchman than himself. I can call this by no other name than that of tyranny and oppression. I know very well that this is not the theory of patronage; but who does better? — do individual patrons? — do Colleges who give in succession? — and as for Bishops, lives there the man so weak, and foolish, so little observant of the past, as to believe (when this tempest of purity and perfection has blown over) that the name of Blomfield will not figure in those benefices from which the names of Copleston, Blomberg, Tate, and Smith, have been so virtuously excluded? I have no desire to make odious comparisons between the purity of one set of patrons and another, but they are forced upon me by the injustice of the Commissioners. I must either make such comparisons, or yield up, without remonstrance, those rights to which I am fairly entitled.

It may be said that the Bishops will do better in future; that now the *public eye* is upon them, they will be shamed into a more lofty and antinepotic spirit; but, if the argument of past superiority be given up, and the hope of future amendment resorted to, why may *we* not improve as well as our masters? but the Commission say, "These excellent men (meaning themselves) have promised to do better, and we have an implicit confidence in their word: we must have the patronage of the Cathedrals." In the meantime we are ready to promise as well as the Bishops.

With regard to that common newspaper phrase *the public eye* — there's nothing (as the Bench well know) more wandering and slippery than the *public eye*. In five years hence the public eye will no more see what description of men are promoted by Bishops, than it will see what Doctors of Law are promoted by the Turkish Uhlema; and at the end of this period (such is the example set by the Commission), the *public eye* turned in every direction

may not be able to see any Bishops at all.

In many instances, Chapters are better patrons than Bishops, because their preferment is not given exclusively to one species of Incumbents. I have a diocese now in my private eye which has undergone the following changes. The first of three Bishops whom I remember was a man of careless easy temper, and how patronage went in those early days may be conjectured by the following letters—which are not his, but serve to illustrate a system:—

THE BISHOP TO LORD A——.

My dear Lord,

I have noticed with great pleasure the behaviour of your Lordship's second son, and am most happy to have it in my power to offer to him the living of * * *. He will find it of considerable value; and there is, I understand, a very good house upon it, &c. &c.

This is to confer a living upon a man of real merit out of the family; into which family, apparently sacrificed to the public good, the living is brought back by the second letter:—

THE SAME TO THE SAME A YEAR AFTER.

My dear Lord,

Will you excuse the liberty I take in soliciting promotion for my grandson? He is an officer of great skill and gallantry, and can bring the most ample testimonials from some of the best men in the profession: the Arethusa frigate is, I understand, about to be commissioned; and if, &c. &c.

Now I am not saying that hundreds of Prebendaries have not committed such enormous and stupendous crimes as this (a declaration which will fill the Whig Cabinet with horror); all that I mean to contend for is, that such is the practice of Bishops quite as much as it is of inferior Patrons.

The second Bishop was a decided enemy of Calvinistical doctrines, and no Clergyman so tainted had the slightest chance of preferment in his diocese.

The third Bishop could endure no man whose principles were not strictly Calvinistic, and who did not give to the Articles that kind of interpretation. Now here were a great mass of Clergy naturally alive to the emoluments of their profession, and not knowing which way to look or stir, because they depended so entirely upon the will of one person. Not otherwise is it with a very Whig Bishop, or a very Tory Bishop: but the worst case is that of a superannuated Bishop: here the preferment is given away, and must be given away by wives and daughters, or by sons, or by butlers, perhaps, and valets, and the poor dying Patron's paralytic hand is guided to the signature of papers, the contents of which he is utterly unable to comprehend. In all such cases as these, the superiority of Bishops as Patrons will not assist that violence which the Commissioners have committed upon the patronage of Cathedrals.

I never heard that Cathedrals had sold the patronage of their preferment; such a practice, however, is not quite unknown among the higher orders of the Church. When the Archbishop of Canterbury consecrates an inferior Bishop, he marks some piece of preferment in the gift of the Bishop as his own. This is denominated an *option*; and when the preferment falls, it is not only in the gift of the Archbishop, if he is alive, but in the gift of his representatives if he is not. It is an absolute chattel, which, like any other chattel, is part of the Archbishop's assets; and if he died in debt, might be taken, and sold, for the benefit of his creditors—and within the memory of man such options have been publicly sold by auction—and if the present Archbishop of Canterbury were to die in debt to-morrow, such might be the fate of his options. What Archbishop Moore did with his options I do not know, but the late Archbishop Sutton very handsomely and properly left them to the present—a bequest, however, which would not have prevented such options from coming to the hammer, if Archbishop Sutton had not cleared off, before his death, those incumbrances which at one period of his life sat so heavily upon him.

What the present Archbishop means to do with them, I am not informed. They are not alluded to in the Church Returns, though they must be worth some thousand pounds. The Commissioners do not seem to know of their existence—at least they are profoundly silent on the subject; and the bill which passed through Parliament in the summer for the regulation of the Emoluments of Bishops does not make the most distant allusion to them. When a parallel was drawn between two species of patrons—which ended in the confiscation of the patronage of Cathedrals—when two Archbishops helped to draw the parallel, and profited by the parallel, I have a perfect right to state this corrupt and unabolished practice of their own sees—a practice which I never heard charged against Deans and Chapters.*

I do not mean to imply, in the most remote degree, that either of the present Archbishops have sold their options, or ever thought of it. Purer and more high-minded gentlemen do not exist, nor men more utterly incapable of doing anything unworthy of their high station; and I am convinced the Archbishop of Canterbury † will imitate or exceed the munificence of his predecessor: but when twenty-four public bodies are to be despoiled of their patronage, we must look not only to present men, but historically, to see how it has been administered in times of old, and in times also recently past; and to remember, that at this moment, when Bishops are set up as the most admirable dispensers of patronage—as the only persons fit to be intrusted with it—as Marvels, for whom law, and justice, and ancient possessions, ought to be set aside, that this patronage (very valuable because selected from the whole diocese) of the two heads of the Church is liable to all the accidents of succession—that it may fall into the hands of a superannuated wife, of a profligate son, of a weak daughter, or a rapacious creditor,—that it may be brought to the hammer, and publicly bid for at an auction, like all the other chattels of the palace; and that such have been the indignities to which this optional patronage has been exposed, from the earliest days of the Church to this moment. Truly, men who live in houses of glass (especially where the panes are so large) ought not to fling stones; or if they do, they should be especially careful at whose head they are flung.

And then the patronage which is not seized—the patronage which the Chapter is allowed to present to its own body—may be divided without their consent. Can anything be more thoroughly lawless, or unjust, than this—that my patronage during my life shall be divided without my consent? How do my rights during my life differ from those of a lay patron, who is tenant for life? and upon what principle of justice or common sense is his patronage protected from the Commissioners' dividing power to which mine is subjected? That one can sell, and the other cannot sell, the next presentation, would be bad reasoning if it were good law; but it is not law, for an Ecclesiastical Corporation, aggregate or sole, can sell a next presentation as legally as a lay life-tenant can do. They have the same power of selling as laymen, but they never do so; that is, they dispense their patronage with greater propriety and delicacy, which, in the estimate of the Commissioners, seems to make their right weaker, and the reasons for taking it away more powerful.

Not only are laymen guarded by the same act which gives the power of dividing livings to the Commissioners, but Bishops are also guarded. The Commissioners may divide the livings of Chapters without their consent; but

* Can anything be more shabby in a Government legislating upon Church abuses, than to pass over such scandals as these existing in high places? Two years have passed, and they are unnoticed.

† The options of the Archbishop of York are comparatively trifling. I never heard, at any period, that they have been sold; but they remain, like those of Canterbury, in the absolute possession of the Archbishop's representatives after his death. I will answer for it that the present Archbishop will do everything with them which becomes his high station and high character. They ought to be abolished by Act of Parliament.

before they can touch the living of a Bishop, his consent must be obtained. It seems, after a few of those examples, to become a little clearer, and more intelligible, why the appointment of any other Ecclesiastics than Bishops was so disagreeable to the Bench.

The reasoning then is this: If a good living be vacant in the patronage of a Chapter, they will only think of conferring it on one of their body or their friends. If such a living fall to the gift of a Bishop, he will totally overlook the interests of his sons and daughters, and divide the living into small portions for the good of the public; and with these sort of anilities, Whig leaders, whose interest it is to lull the Bishops into a reform, pretend to be satisfied; and upon this intolerable nonsense they are not ashamed to justify spoliation.*

A division is set up between public and private patronage, and it is pretended that one is holden in trust for the public, the other is private property. This is mere theory—a slight film thrown over convenient injustice. Henry VIII. gave to the Duke of Bedford much of his patronage. Roger de Hoveden gave to the Church of St. Paul's much of their patronage before the Russells were in existence. The Duke has the legal power to give his preferment to whom he pleases—so have we. We are both under the same moral and religious restraint to administer that patronage properly—the trust is precisely the same to both: and if the public good require it, the power of dividing livings without the consent of patrons should be given in all instances, and not confined as a mark of infamy to Cathedrals alone. This is not the real reason of the difference: Bishops are the active Members of the Commission—they do not choose that their own patronage should be meddled with, and they know that the Laity would not allow for a moment that their livings should be pulled to pieces by Bishops; and that if such a proposal were made, there would be more danger of the Bishop being pulled to pieces than the living. The real distinction is, between the weak and the strong—between those who have power to resist encroachments, and those who have not. This is the reason why we are selected for experiment, and so it is with all the bill from beginning to end. There is purple and fine linen in every line of it.

Another strong objection to the dividing power of the Commission is this: According to the printed bill brought forward last session, if the living be not taken by some members of the body, it lapses to the Bishop. Suppose then the same person to be Bishop and Commissioner, he breaks the living into little pieces as a Commissioner, and after it is rejected in its impoverished state by the Chapter, he gives it away as Bishop of the diocese. The only answer that is given to such objections is, the *impeccability of Bishops*; and upon this principle the whole bill has been constructed: and here is the great mistake about Bishops. They are, upon the whole, very good and worthy men; but they are not (as many ancient ladies suppose) wholly exempt from human infirmities: they have their malice, hatred, uncharitableness, persecution, and interest like other men; and an Administration who did not think it more magnificent to laugh at the lower Clergy, than to protect them, should suffer no Ecclesiastical bill to pass through Parliament without seriously considering how its provisions may affect the happiness of poor Clergymen pushed into living tombs, and pining in solitude—

> Vates procul atque in sola relegant
> Pascua, post montem oppositum, et trans flumina lata.

There is a practice among some Bishops, which may as well be mentioned here as anywhere else, but which I think cannot be too severely reprobated. They send for a Clergyman, and insist upon his giving evidence respecting the character and conduct of his neighbour. Does he hunt? Does

* These reasonings have had their effect, and many early acts of injustice of the Commission have been subsequently corrected.

he shoot? Is he in debt? Is he temperate? Does he attend to his parish? &c. &c. Now what is this but to destroy for all Clergymen the very elements of social life—to put an end to all confidence between man and man—and to disseminate among gentlemen, who are bound to live in concord, every feeling of resentment, hatred, and suspicion? but the very essence of tyranny is to act as if the finer feelings, like the finer dishes, were delicacies only for the rich and great, and that little people have no taste for them and no right to them. A good and honest Bishop (I thank God there are many who deserve that character!) ought to suspect himself, and carefully to watch his own heart. He is all of a sudden elevated from being a tutor, dining at an early hour with his pupil, (and occasionally, it is believed, on cold meat,) to be a spiritual Lord; he is dressed in a magnificent dress, decorated with a title, flattered by Chaplains, and surrounded by little people looking up for the things which he has to give away; and this often happens to a man who has had no opportunities of seeing the world, whose parents were in very humble life, and who has given up all his thoughts to the Frogs of Aristophanes and the Targum of Onkelos. How is it possible that such a man should not lose his head? that he should not swell? that he should not be guilty of a thousand follies, and worry and tease to death (before he recovers his common sense) a hundred men as good, and as wise, and as able as himself? *

The history of the division of Edmonton has, I understand, been repeatedly stated in the Commission—and told as it has been by a decided advocate, and with no sort of evidence called for on the other side of the question, has produced an unfair impression against Chapters. The history is shortly this:—Besides the Mother Church of Edmonton, there are two Chapels—Southgate and Winchmore Hill Chapel. Winchmore Hill Chapel was built by the Society for building Churches, upon the same plan as the portions of Marylebone are arranged: the Clergyman was to be remunerated by the lease of the pews, and if Curates with talents for preaching had been placed there, they might have gained 200*l.* per annum. Though men of perfectly respectable and honourable character, they were not endowed with this sort of talent, and they gained no more than from 90*l.* to 100*l.* per annum. The Bishop of London applied to the Cathedral of St. Paul's to consent to 250*l.* per annum, in addition to the proceeds from the letting of the pews, or that proportion of the whole of the value of the living should be allotted to the chapel of Winchmore; and at the same time we received an application from the chapel at Southgate, that another considerable portion, I forget what, but I believe it to have been rather less (perhaps 200*l.*), should be allotted to them, and the whole living severed into three parishes. Now the living of Edmonton is about 1350*l.* per annum, besides surplice fees; but this 1350*l.* depends upon a Corn Rent of 10*s.* 3*d.* per bushel, present valuation, which at the next valuation would, in the opinion of eminent land surveyors, whom we consulted, be reduced to about 6*s.* per bushel, so that the living, considering the reduction also of all voluntary offerings to the Church, would be reduced one half, and this half was to be divided into three, and one or two Curates (two Curates by the present bill) to be kept by the Vicar of the old Church; and thus three clerical beggars were, by the activity of the Bishop of London, to be established in a district where the extreme dearness of all provisions is the plea for making the See of London double in value to that of any Bishopric in the country. To this we declined to agree; and this, heard only on one side, with the total omission of the changing value of the Benefice from the price of corn, has most probably been the parent of the clause in question. The right cure

* Since writing this, and after declining the living for myself, I have had the pleasure of seeing it presented in an undivided tate to my amiable and excellent friend, Mr. Tate, who, after a long life of moods and tenses, has acquired (as he has deserved) ease and opulence in his old age.

for this and all similar cases would be, to give the Bishop a power of allotting to such Chapels as high a salary as to any other Curate in the diocese, taking, as part of that salary, whatever was received from the lease of the pews, and to this no reasonable man could or would object: but this is not enough — all must bow to one man — "Chapters must be taught submission. No pamphlets, no meeting of independent Prebendaries, to remonstrate against the proceedings of their superiors — no opulence and ease but mine."

Some effect was produced also upon the Commission, by the evidence of a Prelate who is both Dean and Bishop*, and who gave it as his opinion, that the patronage of Bishops was given upon better principles than that of Chapters, which, translated into fair English, is no more than this — that the said witness, not meaning to mislead, but himself deceived, has his own way entirely in his diocese, and can only have it partially in his Chapter.

There is a rumour that these reasonings, with which they were assailed from so many quarters in the last Session of Parliament, have not been without their effect, and that it is the intention of the Commissioners only to take away the patronage from the Cathedrals exactly in proportion as the numbers of their Members are reduced. Such may be the intention of the Commissioners; but as that intention has not been publicly notified, it depends only upon report; and the Commissioners have changed their minds so often, that they may alter their intentions twenty times again before the meeting of Parliament. The whole of my observations in this letter are grounded upon their *bills of last year* — which Lord John Russell stated his intention of re-introducing at the beginning of this Session. If they have any new plans, they ought to have published them three months ago — and to have given to the Clergy an ample opportunity of considering them; but this they take the greatest care never to do. The policy of the Government and of the Commissioners is to hurry their bills through with such rapidity, that very little time is given to those who suffer by them for consideration and remonstrance, and we must be prepared for the worst beforehand. You are cashiered and confiscated before you can look about you — if you leave home for six weeks, in these times, you find a Commissioner in possession of your house and office.

A report has reached my ears, that though all other Cathedrals are to retain patronage exactly equal to their reduced numbers, a separate measure of justice is to be used for St. Paul's; that our numbers are to be augmented by a fifth; and our patronage reduced by a third; and this immediately on the passing of the bill. That the Bishop of Exeter, for instance, is to receive his augmentation of patronage only in proportion as the Prebendaries die off, and the Prebendaries themselves will, as long as they live, remain in the same proportional state as to patronage; and that when they are reduced to four (their stationary number), they will retain one-third of all the patronage the twelve now possess. Whether this be wise or not, is a separate question, but at least it is just; the four who remain cannot with any colour of justice complain that they do not retain all the patronage which was divided among twelve; but at St. Paul's not only are our numbers to be augmented by a fifth, but the patronage of fifteen of our best livings is to be instantly conferred upon the Bishop of London. This little *episode of plunder* involves three separate acts of gross injustice: in the first place, if only our numbers had been augmented by a fifth (in itself a mere bonus to Commissioners), our patronage would have been reduced one fifth in value. Secondly, one third of the preferment is to be taken away immediately, and these two added together make eight fifteenths, or more than one half of our whole patronage. So that when all the Cathedrals are reduced to their reformed numbers, each Cathedral will

* This prelate stated it as his opinion to the Commission, that in future all Prelates ought to declare that they held their patronage in trust for the public.

enjoy precisely the same proportion of patronage as it now does, and each member of every other Cathedral will have precisely the same means of promoting men of merit or men of his own family, as is now possessed; while less than half of these advantages will remain to St. Paul's. Thirdly, if the Bishop of London were to wait (as all the other Bishops by this arrangement must wait) till the present patrons die off, the injustice would be to the future body; but by this scheme, every present incumbent of St. Paul's is instantly deprived of eight fifteenths of his patronage; while every other member of every other Cathedral (as far as patronage is concerned) remains precisely in the same state in which he was before. Why this blow is levelled against St. Paul's I cannot conceive; still less can I imagine why the Bishop of London is not to wait, as all other Bishops are forced to wait, for the death of the present Patrons. There is a reason, indeed, for not waiting, by which (had I to do with a person of less elevated character than the Bishop of London) I would endeavour to explain this precipitate seizure of patronage — and that is, that the livings assigned to him in this remarkable scheme are all very valuable, and the incumbents all very old. But I shall pass over this scheme as a mere supposition, invented to bring the Commission into disrepute, a scheme to which it is utterly impossible the Commissioners should ever affix their names.

I should have thought, if the love of what is just had not excited the Commissioner-Bishops, that the ridicule of men voting such comfortable things to themselves as the Prebendal patronage, would have alarmed them; but they want to sacrifice with other men's hecatombs, and to enjoy, at the same time, the character of great disinterestedness, and the luxury of unjust spoliation. It was thought necessary to make a fund; and the Prebends in the gift of the Bishops* were appropriated to that purpose. The Bishops who consented to this have then made a great sacrifice: — true, but they have taken more out of our pockets than they have disbursed from their own. Where then is the sacrifice? They must either give back the patronage or the martyrdom: if they choose to be martyrs — which I hope they will do — let them give us back our patronage: if they prefer the patronage, they must not talk of being martyrs — they cannot effect this double sensuality and combine the sweet flavour of rapine with the aromatic odour of sanctity.

We are told, if you agitate these questions among yourselves, you will have the democratic Philistines come down upon you, and sweep you all away together. Be it so; I am quite ready to be swept away when the time comes. Everybody has their favourite death: some delight in apoplexy, and others prefer marasmus. I would infinitely rather be crushed by democrats, than, under the plea of the public good, be mildly and blandly absorbed by Bishops.

I met the other day, in an old Dutch Chronicle, with a passage so apposite to this subject, that, though it is somewhat too light for the occasion, I cannot abstain from quoting it. There was a great meeting of all the Clergy at Dordrecht, and the Chronicler thus describes it, which I give in the language of the translation: — "And there was great store of Bishops in the town, in their robes goodly to behold, and all the great men of the State were there, and folks poured in in boats on the Meuse, the Merve, the Rhine, and the Linge, coming from the Isle of Beverlandt and Isselmond, and from all quarters in the Bailiwick of Dort; Arminians and Gomarists, with the friends of John Barneveldt and of Hugh Grote. And before my Lords the Bishops, Simon of Gloucester, who was a Bishop in those parts, disputed

* The Bishops have, however, secured for themselves all the Livings which were in the separate gifts of Prebendaries and Deans, and they have received from the Crown a very large contribution of valuable patronage; why or wherefore is known only to the unfathomable wisdom of Ministers. The glory of martyrdom can be confined only at best to the Bishops of the old Cathedrals, for there are scarcely any separate Prebends in the new Cathedrals.

with Vorstius and Leoline the Monk, and many texts of Scripture were bandied to and fro; and when this was done, and many propositions made, and it waxed towards twelve of the clock, my Lords the Bishops prepared to set them down to a fair repast, in which was great store of good things — and among the rest a roasted peacock, having in lieu of a tail the arms and banners of the Archbishop, which was a goodly sight to all who favoured the Church — and then the Archbishop would say a grace, as was seemly to do, he being a very holy man; but ere he had finished, a great mob of townspeople and folks from the country who were gathered under the window, cried out, *Bread! bread!* for there was a great famine, and wheat had risen to three times the ordinary price of the *sleich**; and when they had done crying *Bread! bread!* they called out *No Bishops!* — and began to cast up stones at the windows. Whereat my Lords the Bishops were in a great fright, and cast their dinner out of the window to appease the mob, and so the men of that town were well pleased, and did devour the meats with a great appetite; and then you might have seen my Lords standing with empty plates, and looking wistfully at each other, till Simon of Gloucester, he who disputed with Leoline the Monk, stood up among them and said, '*Good my Lords, is it your pleasure to stand here fasting, and that those who count lower in the Church than you do should feast and fluster? Let us order to us the dinner of the Deans and Canons, which is making ready for them in the chamber below.*' And this speech of Simon of Gloucester pleased the Bishops much; and so they sent for the host, one William of Ypres, and told him it was for the public good, and he, much fearing the Bishops, brought them the dinner of the Deans and Canons; and so the Deans and Canons went away without dinner, and were pelted by the men of the town, because they had not put any meat out of the window like the Bishops; and when the Count came to hear of it, he said it was a pleasant conceit, *and that the Bishops were right cunning men, and had ding'd the Canons well.*"

When I talk of sacrifices, I mean the sacrifices of the Bishop-Commissioners, for we are given to understand that the great mass of Bishops were never consulted at all about these proceedings; that they are contrary to everything which consultations at Lambeth, previous to the Commission, had led them to expect; and that they are totally disapproved of by them. The voluntary sacrifice, then (for it is no sacrifice if it be not voluntary), is in the Bishop-Commissioners only; and besides the indemnification which they have voted to themselves out of the patronage of the Cathedrals, they will have all that never-ending patronage which is to proceed from the working of the Commission, and the endowments bestowed upon different livings. So much for episcopal sacrifices!

And who does not see the end and meaning of all this? The Lay Commissioners, who are members of the Government, cannot and will not attend — the Archbishops of York and Canterbury are quiet and amiable men, going fast down in the vale of life — some of the members of the Commission are expletives — some must be absent in their dioceses — the Bishop of London is passionately fond of labour, has certainly no aversion to power, is of quick temper, great ability, thoroughly versant in ecclesiastical law, and always in London. He will become the Commission, and when the Church of England is mentioned, it will only mean *Charles James of London*, who will enjoy a greater power than has ever been possessed by any Churchman since the days of Laud, and will become the *Church of England here upon earth.* As for the Commission itself, there is scarcely any power which is not given to it. They may call for every paper in the world, and every human creature who possesses it, and do what they like to one or the other. It is hopeless to contend with such a body; and most painful to think that it has been esta-

* A measure in the Bailiwick of Dort, containing two gallons one pint English dry measure.

blished under a Whig Government.* A Commission of Tory Churchmen, established for such purposes, should have been framed with the utmost jealousy, and with the most cautious circumspection of its powers, and with the most earnest wish for its extinction when the purposes of its creation were answered. The Government have done everything in their power to make it vexatious, omnipotent, and everlasting. This immense power, flung into the hands of an individual, is one of the many foolish consequences which proceed from the centralisation of the bill, and the unwillingness to employ the local knowledge of the Bishops in the process of annexing dignified to parochial preferment.

There is a third bill concocted by the Commission-Bishops, in which the great principle of increasing the power of the Bench has certainly not been lost sight of:—A brother Clergyman falls ill suddenly in the country, and he begs his clerical neighbour to do duty for him in the afternoon, thinking it better that there should be single service in two churches, than two services in one, and none in the other. The Clergyman who accedes to this request is liable to a penalty of 5*l*. There is a harshness and ill nature in this—a gross ignorance of the state of the poorer Clergy—a hardheartedness produced by the long enjoyment of wealth and power, which makes it quite intolerable. I speak of it as it stands in the bill of last year.†

If a Clergyman has a living of 400*l*. per annum, and a population of two thousand persons, the Bishop can compel him to keep a Curate to whom he can allot any salary which he may allot to any other Curate; in other words, he may take away half the income of the Clergyman, and instantly ruin him—and this without any complaint from the Vestry; with every testimonial of the most perfect satisfaction of the Parish in the labours of a Minister, who may, perhaps, be dedicating his whole life to their improvement. I think I remember that the Bishop of London once attempted this before he was a Commissioner, and was defeated. I had no manner of doubt that it would speedily become the law, after the Commission had begun to operate. The Bishop of London is said to have declared, after this trial, that *if it was not law it should soon be law**: and *law* you will see it will become. In fact, he can slip into any Ecclesiastical Act of Parliament anything he pleases. There is nobody to heed or to contradict him; provided the power of Bishops is extended by it, no Bishop is so ungenteel as to oppose the Act of his Right Reverend Brother; and there are not many men who have knowledge, eloquence, or force of character to stand up against the Bishop of London, and, above all, of industry to watch him. The Ministry, and the Lay Lords, and the House of Commons, care nothing about the matter; and the Clergy themselves, in a state of the greatest ignorance as to what is passing in the world, find their chains heavier and heavier, without knowing who or what has produced the additional encumbrance. A good honest Whig Minister should have two or three stout-hearted parish priests in his train to watch the Bishops' bills, and to see that they were constructed on other principles than that *Bishops can do no wrong, and cannot have too much power.* The Whigs do nothing of this, and yet they complain that they are hated by the Clergy, and that in all elections the Clergy are their bitterest enemies. Suppose they were to try a little justice, a little notice, and a little protection. It would take more time than quizzing, and contempt, but it might do some good.

The Bishop puts a great number of questions to his Clergy, which they are

* I am speaking here of the permanent Commission established by Act of Parliament in 1835. The Commission for reporting had come to an end six months before this letter was written.

† This is also given up.

* The Bishop of London denies that he ever said this; but the Bishop of London affects short sharp sayings, seasoned, I am afraid, sometimes with a little indiscretion; and these sayings are not necessarily forgotten because he forgets them.

to be compelled, by this new law of the Commission, to answer, under a penalty, and if they do answer them, they incur, perhaps, a still heavier penalty. "Have you had two services in your Church all the year?"—"I decline to answer."—"Then I fine you 20*l.*"—"I have only had one service."—"Then I fine you 250*l.*" In what other profession are men placed between this double fire of penalties, and compelled to criminate themselves? It has been disused in England, I believe, ever since the time of Laud and the Star Chamber.*

By the same bill, as it first emanated from the Commission, a Bishop could compel a Clergyman to expend three years' income upon a house in which he had resided perhaps fifty years, and in which he had brought up a large family. With great difficulty, some slight modification of this enormous power was obtained, and it was a little improved in the amended bill.† In the same way an attempt was made to try delinquent Clergymen by a jury of Clergymen, nominated by the Bishop; but this was too bad, and was not endured for an instant; still it showed the same love of power and the same principle of *impeccability*, for the bill is expressly confined to all suits and complaints against persons *below the dignity and degree of Bishops*. The truth is, that there are very few men in either House of Parliament (Ministers or any one else), who ever think of the happiness and comfort of the working Clergy, or bestow one thought upon guarding them from the increased and increasing power of their encroaching masters. What is called taking care of the Church is taking care of the Bishops; and all bills for the management of the Clergy are left to the concoction of men who very naturally believe they are improving the Church when they are increasing their own power. There are many Bishops too generous, too humane, and too Christian, to oppress a poor Clergyman; but I have seen (I am sorry to say) many grievous instances of partiality, rudeness, and oppression.* I have seen Clergymen treated by them with a violence and contempt which the lowest servant in the Bishop's establishment would not have endured for a single moment; and if there be a helpless, friendless, wretched being in the community, it is a poor Clergyman in the country, with a large family. If there be an object of compassion, he is one. If there be any occasion in life where a great man should lay aside his office, and put on those kind looks, and use those kind words which raise the humble from the dust, these are the occasions when those best parts of the Christian character ought to be displayed.

I would instance the unlimited power which a Bishop possesses over a Curate, as a very unfair degree of power for any man to possess. Take the following dialogue, which represents a real event.

Bishop.—Sir, I understand you frequent the Meetings of the Bible Society?

Curate.—Yes, my Lord, I do.

Bishop.—Sir, I tell you plainly, if you continue to do so, I shall silence you from preaching in my diocese.

Curate.—My Lord, I am very sorry to incur your indignation, but I frequent that Society upon principle, because I think it eminently serviceable to the cause of the Gospel.

* This attempt upon the happiness and independence of the Clergy has been abandoned.

† I perceive that the Archbishop of Canterbury borrows money for the improvement of his palace, and pays the principal off in forty years. This is quite as soon as a debt incurred for such public purposes ought to be paid off, and the Archbishop has done rightly to take that period. In process of time I think it very likely that this indulgence will be extended to country Clergymen, who are compelled to pay off the debts for buildings (which they are compelled to undertake) in twenty years; and by the new bill, not yet passed, this indulgence is extended to thirty years. Why poor Clergymen have been compelled for the last five years to pay off the encumbrances at the rate of one twentieth per annum, and are now compelled to pay them off, or will, when the bill passes, be so compelled, at the rate of one thirtieth per annum, when the Archbishop takes forty years to do the same thing, and has made that bargain in the year 1831, I really cannot tell. A Clergyman who does not reside is forced to pay off his building debt in ten years.

* What Bishops like best in their Clergy is a dropping-down-deadness of manner.

Bishop.—Sir, I do not enter into your reasons, but tell you plainly, if you continue to go there you shall be silenced.

The young man did go, and was silenced;—and as Bishops have always a great deal of clever machinery at work of testimonials and *bene-decessits*, and always a lawyer at their elbow, under the name of a secretary, a Curate excluded from one diocese is excluded from all. His remedy is an appeal to the Archbishop from the Bishop: his worldly goods, however, amount to ten pounds: he never was in London: he dreads such a tribunal as an Archbishop: he thinks, perhaps, in time the Bishop may be softened: if he is compelled to restore him, the enmity will be immortal. It would be just as rational to give to a frog or a rabbit, upon which the physician is about to experiment, an appeal to the Zoological Society, as to give to a country Curate an appeal to the Archbishop against his purple oppressor.

The errors of the bill are a public concern—the injustice of the bill is a private concern. Give us our patronage for life.* Treat the Cathedrals all alike, with the same measure of justice. Don't divide livings in the patronage of present Incumbents without their consent—or do the same with all livings. If these points be attended to in the forthcoming bill, *all complaint of unfairness and injustice will be at an end.* I shall still think, that the Commissioners have been very rash and indiscreet, that they have evinced a contempt for existing institutions, and a spirit of destruction which will be copied to the life hereafter, by Commissioners of a very different description. Bishops live in high places with high people, or with little people who depend upon them. They walk delicately, like Agag. They hear only one sort of conversation, and avoid bold reckless men, as a lady veils herself from rough breezes. I am half inclined to think sometimes, that the Bishop-Commissioners really think that they are finally settling the Church; that the House of Lords will be open to the Bench for ages; and that many Archbishops in succession will enjoy their fifteen thousand pounds a year in Lambeth. I wish I could do for the Bishop-Commissioners what his mother did for Æneas, in the last days of Troy:—

> Omnem quæ nunc obducta tuenti
> Mortales hebetat visus tibi, et humida circum
> Caligat, nubem eripiam.
> Apparent diræ facies, &c. &c.

It is ominous for liberty when Sydney and Russell cannot agree; but when Lord John Russell, in the House of Commons, said, that we showed no disposition to make any sacrifices for the good of the Church, I took the liberty to remind that excellent person that he must first of all *prove* it to be for the good of the Church that our patronage should be taken away by the Bishops, and then he might find fault with us for not consenting to the sacrifice.

I have little or no personal nor pecuniary interest in these things, and have made all possible exertion (as two or three persons in power well know) that they should not come before the public. I have no son nor son-in-law in the Church, for whom I want any patronage. If I were young enough to survive any incumbent of St. Paul's, my own preferment is too agreeably circumstanced to make it at all probable I should avail myself of the opportunity. I am a sincere advocate for Church Reform; but I think it very possible, and even very easy, to have removed all odium from the Establishment, in a much less violent and revolutionary manner, without committing or attempting such flagrant acts of injustice, and without leaving behind an odious Court of Inquisition, which will inevitably fall into the hands of a single individual, and will be an eternal source of vexation, jealousy, and change. I give sincere credit to the Commissioners for good intentions. How can such men have intended anything but good? And I firmly believe that they are hardly conscious of the extraordinary predilection they have shown

* This has now been given to us.

for Bishops in all their proceedings: it is like those errors in tradesmen's bills of which the retail arithmetician is really unconscious, but which somehow or another always happen to be in his own favour. Such men as the Commissioners do not say this patronage belongs justly to the Cathedrals, and we will take it away unjustly for ourselves; but after the manner of human nature a thousand weak reasons prevail, which would have no effect, if self-interest were not concerned: they are practising a deception on themselves, and sincerely believe they are doing right. When I talk of spoil and plunder, I do not speak of the intention, but of the effect, and the precedent.

Still the Commissioners are on the eve of entailing an immense evil upon the country, and unfortunately they have gone so far, that it is necessary they should ruin the Cathedrals to preserve their character for consistency. They themselves have been frightened a great deal too much by the mob; have overlooked the chances in their favour produced by delay; have been afraid of being suspected (as Tories) of not doing enough; and have allowed themselves to be hurried on by the constitutional impetuosity of one man, who cannot be brought to believe that wisdom often consists in leaving alone, standing still and doing nothing. From the joint operation of all these causes, all the Cathedrals of England will in a few weeks be knocked about our ears. You, Mr. Archdeacon Singleton, will sit like Caius Marius on the ruins, and we shall lose for ever the wisest scheme for securing a well-educated Clergy upon the most economical terms, and for preventing that low fanaticism which is the greatest curse upon human happiness, and the greatest enemy of true religion. We shall have all the evils of an Establishment, and none of its good.

You tell me I shall be laughed at as a rich and overgrown Churchman. Be it so. I have been laughed at a hundred times in my life, and care little or nothing about it. If I am well provided for now — I have had my full share of the blanks in the lottery as well as the prizes. Till thirty years of age I never received a farthing from the Church; then 50*l.* per annum for two years — then nothing for ten years — then 500*l.* per annum, increased for two or three years to 800*l.*, till, in my grand climacteric, I was made Canon of St. Paul's; and before that period, I had built a Parsonage-house with farm offices for a large farm, which cost me 4000*l.*, and had reclaimed another from ruins at the expense of 2000*l.* A Lawyer, or a Physician in good practice, would smile at this picture of great Ecclesiastical wealth; and yet I am considered as a perfect monster of Ecclesiastical prosperity.

I should be very sorry to give offence to the dignified Ecclesiastics who are in the Commission: I hope they will allow for the provocation, if I have been a little too warm in the defence of St. Paul's, which I have taken a solemn oath to defend. I was at school and college with the Archbishop of Canterbury: fifty-three years ago he knocked me down with the chess-board for checkmating him — and now he is attempting to take away my patronage. I believe these are the only two acts of violence he ever committed in his life: the interval has been one of gentleness, kindness, and the most amiable and high-principled courtesy to his Clergy. For the Archbishop of York I feel an affectionate respect — the result of that invariable kindness I have received from him: and who can see the Bishop of London without admiring his superior talents—being pleased with his society —without admitting that, *upon the whole**, the public is benefited by his ungovernable passion for business; and without receiving the constant workings of a really good heart, as an atonement for the occasional excesses of an impetuous disposition? I am quite sure if the tables had been turned, and if it had been his lot, as a Canon,

* I have heard that the Bishop of London employs eight hours per day in the government of his diocese—in which no part of Asia, Africa, or America is included. The world is, I believe, taking one day with another, governed in about a third of that time.

to fight against the encroachments of Bishops, that he would have made as stout a defence as I have done — the only difference is, that he would have done it with much greater talent.

As for my friends the Whigs, I neither wish to offend them nor anybody else. I consider myself to be as good a Whig as any amongst them. I was a Whig before many of them were born —and while some of them were Tories and Waverers. I have always turned out to fight their battles, and when I saw no other Clergyman turn out but myself—and this in times before liberality was well recompensed, and therefore in fashion, and when the smallest appearance of it seemed to condemn a Churchman to the grossest obloquy, and the most hopeless poverty. It may suit the purpose of the Ministers to flatter the Bench; it does not suit mine. I do not choose in my old age to be tossed as a prey to the Bishop; I have not deserved this of my Whig friends. I know very well there can be no justice for Deans and Chapters, and that the momentary Lords of the earth will receive our statement with derision and *persiflage*—the great principle which is now called in for the government of mankind. Nobody admires the general conduct of the Whig Administration more than I do. They have conferred, in their domestic policy, the most striking benefits on the country. To say that there is no risk in what they have done is mere nonsense: there is great risk; and all honest men must balance to counteract it—holding back as firmly down hill as they pulled vigorously up hill. Still, great as the risk is, it was worth while to incur it in the Poor Law Bill, in the Tithe Bill, in the Corporation Bill, and in the circumscription of the Irish Protestant Church. In all these matters, the Whig Ministry, after the heat of party is over, and when Joseph Hume and Wilson Croker* are powdered into the dust of death, will gain great and deserved fame. In the question of the Church Commission they have behaved with the grossest injustice; delighted to see this temporary delirium of Archbishops and Bishops, scarcely believing their eyes, and carefully suppressing their laughter, when they saw these eminent Conservatives laying about them with the fury of Mr. Tyler or Mr. Straw; they have taken the greatest care not to disturb them, and to give them no offence: "Do as you like, my Lords, with the Chapters and the Parochial Clergy; you will find some pleasing morsels in the ruins of the Cathedrals. Keep for yourselves anything you like—whatever is agreeable to you cannot be unpleasant to us." In the meantime, the old friends of, and the old sufferers for, liberty, do not understand this new meanness, and are not a little astonished to find their leaders prostrate on their knees before the Lords of the Church, and to receive no other answer from them than that, if they are disturbed in their adulation, they will immediately resign!

I remain,
My dear Sir,
With sincere good will and respect,
Yours,
SYDNEY SMITH.

* I meant no harm by the comparison, but I have made two bitter enemies by it.

SECOND LETTER

TO

ARCHDEACON SINGLETON.

My dear Sir,

It is a long time since you have heard from me, and in the mean time the poor Church of England has been trembling, from the Bishop who sitteth upon the throne, to the Curate who rideth upon the hackney horse. I began writing on the subject to avoid bursting from indignation; and as it is not my habit to recede, I will go on till the Church of England is either up or down — semianimous on its back, or vigorous on its legs.

Two or three persons have said to me — "Why, after writing an entertaining and successful letter to Archdeacon Singleton, do you venture upon another, in which you may probably fail, and be weak or stupid?" All this I utterly depise: I write upon these matters not to be entertaining, but because the subjects are very important, and because I have strong opinions upon them. If what I write is liked, so much the better; but liked or not liked, sold or not sold, Wilson Crokered or not Wilson Crokered, I will write. If you ask me who excites me — I answer you, it is that Judge who stirs good thoughts in honest hearts — under whose warrant I impeach the wrong, and by whose help I hope to chastise it.

There are in most Cathedrals two sorts of Prebendaries — the one resident, the other non-resident. It is proposed by the Church Commission to abolish all the Prebendaries of the latter and many of the former class; and it is the Prebendaries of the former class, the Resident Prebendaries, whom I wish to save.

The Non-resident Prebendaries never come near the Cathedral; they are just like so many country gentlemen: the difference is, that their appointments are elective, not hereditary. They have houses, manors, lands, and every appendage of territorial wealth and importance. Their value is very different. I have one, Neasdon, near Willesdon, which consists of a quarter of an acre of land, worth a few shillings per annum, but animated by the burden of repairing a bridge, which sometimes costs the unfortunate Prebendary fifty or sixty pounds. There are other Non-resident Prebendaries, however, of great value; and one, I believe, which would be worth, if the years or lives were run out, from 40,000*l.* to 60,000*l.* per annum.

Not only do these Prebendaries do nothing, and are never seen, but the existence of the preferment is hardly known; and the abolition of the preferment, therefore, would not in any degree lessen the temptation to enter into the Church, while the mass of these preferments would make an important fund for the improvement of small livings. The Residentiary Prebendaries, on the contrary, perform all the services of the Cathedral Church; their existence is known, their preferment coveted, and to get a stall, and to be preceded by men with silver rods, is the bait which the ambitious squire is perpetually holding out to his second

son. What Prebendary is next to come into residence is as important a topic to the Cathedral town, and ten miles round it, as what the evening or morning star may be to the astronomer. I will venture to say, that there is not a man of good humour, sense, and worth, within ten miles of Worcester, who does not hail the rising of Archdeacon Singleton in the horizon as one of the most agreeable events of the year. If such sort of preferments are extinguished, a very serious evil (as I have often said before) is done to the Church — the service becomes unpopular, further spoliation is dreaded, the whole system is considered to be altered and degraded, capital is withdrawn from the Church, and no one enters into the profession but the sons of farmers and little tradesmen, who would be footmen if they were not vicars — or figure on the coach-box if they were not lecturing from the pulpit.

But what a practical rebuke to the Commissioners, after all their plans and consultations and carvings of Cathedral preferment, to leave it integral, and untouched! It is some comfort, however, to me, to think, that the persons of all others to whom this preservation of Cathedral property would give the greatest pleasure are the Ecclesiastical Commissioners themselves. Can any one believe that the Archbishop of Canterbury or the Bishop of London really wish for the confiscation of any Cathedral property, or that they were driven to it by anything but fear, mingled, perhaps, with a little vanity of playing the part of great Reformers? They cannot, of course, say for themselves what I say for them; but of what is really passing in the ecclesiastical minds of these great personages, I have no more doubt than I have of what passes in the mind of the prisoner when the prosecutor recommends and relents, and the Judge says he shall attend to the recommendation.

What harm does a Prebend do, in a politico-economical point of view? The alienation of the property for three lives, or twenty-one years, and the almost certainty that the tenant has of renewing, give him sufficient interest in the soil for all purposes of cultivation*, and a long series of elected clergymen is rather more likely to produce valuable members of the community than a long series of begotten squires. Take, for instance, the Cathedral of Bristol, the whole estates of which are about equal to keeping a pack of fox-hounds. If this had been in the hands of a country gentleman, instead of Precentor, Succentor, Dean, and Canons, and Sexton, you would have had huntsman, whipper in, dog-feeders, and stoppers of earths; the old squire, full of foolish opinions, and fermented liquids, and a young gentleman of gloves, waistcoats, and pantaloons: and how many generations might it be before the fortuitous concourse of noodles would produce such a man as Professor Lee, one of the Prebendaries of Bristol, and by far the most eminent Oriental scholar in Europe? The same argument might be applied to every Cathedral in England. How many hundred coveys of squires would it take to supply as much knowledge as is condensed in the heads of Dr. Copplestone, or Mr. Tate, of St. Paul's? and what a strange thing it is that such a man as Lord John Russell, the Whig leader, should be so squirrel-minded as to wish for a movement without object or end! Saving there can be none, for it is merely taking from one Ecclesiastic to give it to another; public clamour, to which the best men must sometimes yield, does not require it; and so far from doing any good, it would be a source of infinite mischief to the Establishment.

If you were to gather a Parliament of Curates on the hottest Sunday in the year, after all the services, sermons, burials, and baptisms of the day, were over, and to offer them such increase of

* The Church, it has been urged, do not plant—they do not extend their woods; but almost all Cathedrals possess woods, and regularly plant a succession, so as to keep them up. A single evening of dice and hazard does not doom their woods to sudden destruction; a life-tenant does not cut down all the timber to make the most of his estate; the woods of ecclesiastical bodies are managed upon a fixed and settled plan, and considering the sudden prodigalities of Laymen, I should not be afraid of a comparison.

salary as would be produced by the confiscation of the Cathedral property, I am convinced they would reject the measure, and prefer splendid hope, and the expectation of good fortune in advanced life, to the trifling improvement of poverty which such a fund could afford. Charles James, of London, was a Curate; the Bishop of Winchester was a Curate; almost every rose-and-shovelman has been a Curate in his time. All Curates hope to draw great prizes.

I am surprised it does not strike the mountaineers how very much the great emoluments of the Church are flung open to the lowest ranks of the community. Butchers, bakers, publicans, schoolmasters, are perpetually seeing their children elevated to the mitre. Let a respectable baker drive through the city from the west end of the town, and let him cast an eye on the battlements of Northumberland House; has his little muffin-faced son the smallest chance of getting in among the Percies, enjoying a share of their luxury and splendour, and of chasing the deer with hound and horn upon the Cheviot Hills? But let him drive his alum-steeped loaves a little further, till he reaches St. Paul's Churchyard, and all his thoughts are changed when he sees that beautiful fabric; it is not impossible that his little penny roll may be introduced into that splendid oven. Young Crumpet is sent to school—takes to his books—spends the best years of his life, as all eminent Englishmen do, in making Latin verses—knows that the *crum* in crum-pet is long, and the *pet* short—goes to the University—gets a prize for an Essay on the Dispersion of the Jews—takes orders—becomes a Bishop's chaplain—has a young nobleman for his pupil—publishes an useless classic, and a serious call to the unconverted—and then goes through the Elysian transitions of Prebendary, Dean, Prelate, and the long train of purple, profit, and power.

It will not do to leave only four persons in each Cathedral upon the supposition that such a number will be sufficient for all the men of real merit who ought to enjoy such preferment; we ought to have a steady confidence that the men of real merit will always bear a small proportion to the whole number; and that in proportion as the whole number is lessened, the number of men of merit provided for will be lessened also. If it were quite certain that ninety persons would be selected, the most remarkable for conduct, piety, and learning, ninety offices might be sufficient; but out of these ninety are to be taken tutors to Dukes and Marquises, paid in this way by the public; Bishops' Chaplains, running tame about the palace; elegant Clergymen of small understanding, who have made themselves acceptable in the drawing-rooms of the mitre; Billingsgate controversialists, who have tossed and gored an Unitarian. So that there remain but a few rewards for men of real merit—yet these rewards do infinite good; and in this mixed, checkered way human affairs are conducted.

No man at the beginning of the Reform could tell to what excesses the new power conferred upon the multitude would carry them; it was not safe for a Clergyman to appear in the streets. I bought a blue coat, and did not despair in time of looking like a Layman. All this is passed over. Men are returned to their senses upon the subject of the Church, and I utterly deny that there is any public feeling whatever which calls for the destruction of the resident Prebends. Lord John Russell has pruned the two luxuriant Bishopries, and has abolished Pluralities: he has made a very material alteration in the state of the Church: not enough to please Joseph Hume, and the tribunes of the people, but enough to satisfy every reasonable and moderate man, and therefore enough to satisfy himself. What another generation may choose to do is another question: I am thoroughly convinced that enough has been done for the present.

Viscount Melbourne declared himself quite satisfied with the Church as it is; but if the public had any desire to alter it, they might do as they pleased. He might have said the same

thing of the Monarchy, or of any other of our institutions; and there is in the declaration a permissiveness and good humour which in public men has seldom been exceeded. Carelessness, however, is but a poor imitation of genius, and the formation of a wise and well-reflected plan of Reform conduces more to the lasting fame of a Minister than that affected contempt of duty which every man sees to be mere vanity, and a vanity of no very high description.

But if the truth must be told, our Viscount is somewhat of an impostor. Everything about him seems to betoken careless desolation: any one would suppose from his manner that he was playing at chuck-farthing with human happiness; that he was always on the heel of pastime; that he would giggle away the Great Charter, and decide by the method of tee-totum whether my Lords the Bishops should or should not retain their seats in the House of Lords. All this is the mere vanity of surprising, and making us believe that he can play with kingdoms as other men can with nine-pins. Instead of this lofty nebulo, this miracle of moral and intellectual felicities, he is nothing more than a sensible honest man, who means to do his duty to the Sovereign and to the Country: instead of being the ignorant man he pretends to be, before he meets the deputation of Tallow-Chandlers in the morning, he sits up half the night talking with Thomas Young about melting and skimming, and then, though he has acquired knowledge enough to work off a whole vat of prime Leicester tallow, he pretends next morning not to know the difference between a dip and a mould. In the same way, when he has been employed in reading Acts of Parliament, he would persuade you that he has been reading *Cleghorn on the Beatitudes*, or *Pickler on the Nine Difficult Points*. Neither can I allow to this Minister (however he may be irritated by the denial) the extreme merit of indifference to the consequences of his measures. I believe him to be conscientiously alive to the good or evil that he is doing, and that his caution has more than once arrested the gigantic projects of the Lycurgus of the Lower House. I am sorry to hurt any man's feelings, and to brush away the magnificent fabric of levity and gaiety he has reared; but I accuse our Minister of honesty and diligence: I deny that he is careless or rash: he is nothing more than a man of good understanding, and good principle, disguised in the eternal and somewhat wearisome affectation of a political Roué.

One of the most foolish circumstances attending this destruction of Cathedral property is the great sacrifice of the patronage of the Crown: the Crown gives up eight Prebends of Westminster, two at Worcester, 1500*l.* per annum at St. Paul's, two Prebends at Bristol, and a great deal of other preferment all over the kingdom; and this at a moment when such extraordinary power has been suddenly conferred upon the people, and when every atom of power and patronage ought to be husbanded for the Crown. A Prebend of Westminster for my second son would soften the Catos of Cornhill, and lull the Gracchi of the Metropolitan Boroughs. Lives there a man so absurd, as to suppose that Government can be carried on without those gentle allurements? You may as well attempt to poultice off the humps of a camel's back as to cure mankind of these little corruptions.

I am terribly alarmed by a committee of Cathedrals now sitting in London, and planning a petition to the Legislature to be heard by counsel. They will take such high ground, and talk a language so utterly at variance with the feelings of the age about Church Property, that I am much afraid they will do more harm than good. In the time of Lord George Gordon's riots, the Guards said they did not care for the mob, if the Gentlemen Volunteers behind would be so good as not to hold their muskets in such a dangerous manner. I don't care for popular clamour, and think it might now be defied; but I confess the Gentleman Volunteers alarm me. They have unfortunately, too, collected

their addresses, and published them in a single volume ! ! !

I should like to know how many of our institutions at this moment, besides the Cathedrals, are under notice of destruction. I will, before I finish my letter, endeavour to procure a list: in the meantime I will give you the bill of fare with which the last Session opened, and I think that of 1838 will not be less copious. But at the opening of the Session of 1837, when I addressed my first letter to you, this was the state of our intended changes: —The Law of Copyright was to be re-created by Sergeant Talfourd; Church Rates abolished by Lord John Russell, and Imprisonment for Debt by the Attorney-General: the Archbishop of Canterbury kindly undertook to destroy all the Cathedrals, and Mr. Grote was to arrange our Voting by Ballot; the Septennial Act was to be repealed by Mr. Williams, Corn Laws abolished by Mr. Clay, and the House of Lords reformed by Mr. Ward; Mr. Hume remodelled County Rates, Mr. Ewart put an end to Primogeniture, and Mr. Tooke took away the Exclusive Privileges of Dublin, Oxford, and Cambridge; Thomas Duncombe was to put an end to the Proxies of the Lords, and Sergeant Prime to turn the Universities topsy-turvy. Well may it be said that

"Man never continueth in one stay."

See how men accustom themselves to large and perilous changes. Ten years ago, if a cassock or a hassock had been taken from the Establishment, the current of human affairs would have been stopped till restitution had been made. In a fortnight's time, Lord John Russell is to take possession of, and to repartition all the Cathedrals in England; and what a prelude for the young Queen's coronation! what a medal for the august ceremony! — the fallen Gothic buildings on one side of the gold, the young Protestant Queen on the other: —

Victoria Ecclesiæ Victrix.

And then, when she is full of noble devices, and of all sorts enchantingly beloved, and amid the solemn swell of music, when her heart beats happily, and her eyes look Majesty, she turns them on the degraded Ministers of the Gospel, and shudders to see she is stalking to the throne of her Protestant ancestors over the broken altars of God.

Now, remember, I hate to overstate my case. I do not say that the destruction of Cathedrals will put an end to railroads: I believe that good mustard and cress, sown after Lord John's Bill is passed, will, if duly watered, continue to grow. I do not say that the country has no *right*, after the death of individual incumbents, to do what they propose to do; — I merely say that it is inexpedient, uncalled for, and mischievous — that the lower Clergy, for whose sake it is proposed to be done, do not desire it — that the Bishop-Commissioners, who proposed it, would be heartily glad if it were put an end to — that it will lower the character of those who enter into the Church, and accustom the English people to large and dangerous confiscations: and I would not have gentlemen of the money-bags, and of wheat and bean land, forget that the Church means many other things than Thirty-nine Articles, and a discourse of five-and-twenty minutes' duration on the Sabbath. It means a check to the conceited rashness of experimental reasoners — an adhesion to old moral land-marks — an attachment to the happiness we have gained from tried institutions greater than the expectation of that which is promised by novelty and change. The loud cry of ten thousand teachers of justice and worship — that cry which masters the *Borgias* and *Catilines* of the world, and guards from devastation the best works of God —

Magnâ testantur voce per orbem
Discite justitiam moniti et non temnere divos.

In spite of his uplifted chess-board, I cannot let my old schoolfellow, the Archbishop of Canterbury, off, without harping a little upon his oath which he has taken to preserve the rights and property of the Church of Canterbury: I am quite sure so truly good a man,

as from the bottom of my heart I believe him to be, has some line of argument by which he defends himself; but till I know it, I cannot of course say I am convinced by it. The common defence for breaking oaths is, that they are contracts made with another party, which the Creator is called to witness, and from which the swearer is absolved if those for whom the oath is taken choose to release him from his obligation. With whom, then, is the contract made by the Archbishop? Is it with the community at large? If so, nothing but an Act of Parliament (as the community at large have no other organ) could absolve him from his oath; but three years before any act is passed, he puts his name to a plan for taking away two-thirds of the property of the Church of Canterbury. If the contract be not made with the community at large, but with the Church of Canterbury, every member of it is in decided hostility to his scheme. O'Connell takes an oath that he will not injure nor destroy the Protestant Church; but in promoting the destruction of some of the Irish Bishoprics, he may plead that he is sacrificing a part to preserve the whole, and benefiting, not injuring, the Protestant establishment. But the Archbishop does not swear to a general truth, where the principle may be preserved, though there is an apparent deviation from the words; but he swears to a very narrow and limited oath, that he will not alienate the possessions of the Church of Canterbury. A friend of mine has suggested to me that his Grace has perhaps forgotten the oath; but this cannot be, for the first Protestant in Europe of course makes a memorandum in his pocket-book of all the oaths he takes to do, or to abstain. The oath, however, may be less present to the Archbishop's memory, from the fact of his not having taken the oath in person, but by the medium of a gentleman sent down by the coach to take it for him—a practice which, though I believe it to have been long established in the Church, surprised me, I confess, not a little. A proxy to vote, if you please—a proxy to consent to arrangements of estates if wanted; but a proxy sent down in the Canterbury Fly, to take the Creator to witness that the Archbishop, detained in town by business, or pleasure, will never violate that foundation of piety over which he presides—all this seems to me an act of the most extraordinary indolence ever recorded in history. If an Ecclesiastic, not a Bishop, may express any opinion on the reforms of the Church, I recommend that Archbishops and Bishops should take no more oaths by proxy; but, as they do not wait upon the Sovereign or the Prime Minister, or even any of the Cabinet, by proxy, that they should also perform all religious acts in their own person. This practice would have been abolished in Lord John's first Bill, if other grades of Churchmen as well as Bishops had been made Commissioners. But the motto was—

"Peace to the Palaces—war to the Manses."

I have been informed, though I will not answer for the accuracy of the information, that this vicarious oath is likely to produce a scene which would have puzzled the *Ductor Dubitantium*. The attorney who took the oath for the Archbishop is, they say, seized with religious horrors at the approaching confiscation of Canterbury property, and has in vain tendered back his 6*s.* 8*d.* for taking the oath. The Archbishop refuses to accept it; and feeling himself light and disencumbered, wisely keeps the saddle upon the back of the writhing and agonised scrivener. I have talked it over with several Clergymen, and the general opinion is, that the scrivener will suffer.

I cannot help thinking that a great opportunity opens itself for improving the discipline of the Church, by means of those Chapters which Lord John Russell* is so anxious to destroy;

* I only mention Lord John Russell's name so often, because the management of the Church measures devolves upon him. He is beyond all comparison the ablest man in the whole Administration, and to such a degree is he superior, that the Government could not exist a moment without him. If the Foreign Secretary were to retire, we should no longer be nibbling ourselves into

divide the diocese among the members of the Chapter, and make them responsible for the superintendence and inspection of the Clergy in their various divisions under the supreme control of the Bishop; by a few additions they might be made the Bishop's Council for the trial of delinquent Clergymen. They might be made a kind of college for the general care of education in the diocese, and applied to a thousand useful purposes, which would have occurred to the Commissioners, if they had not been so dreadfully frightened, and to the Government, if their object had been, not to please the Dissenters, but to improve the Church.

The Bishop of Lincoln has lately published a pamphlet on the Church question. His Lordship is certainly not a man full of felicities and facilities, imitating none, and inimitable of any; nor does he work with infinite agitation of wit. His creation has blood without heat, bones without marrow, eyes without speculation. He has the art of saying nothing in many words beyond any man that ever existed; and when he seems to have made a proposition, he is so dreadfully frightened at it, that he proceeds as quickly as possible, in the ensuing sentence, to disconnect the subject and the predicate, and to avert the dangers he has incurred:—but as he is a Bishop, and will be therefore more read than I am, I cannot pass him over.

His Lordship tells us, that it was at one time under consideration of the Commissioners whether they should not tax all benefices above a certain value, in order to raise a fund for the improvement of smaller livings; and his Lordship adds, with the greatest innocence, that the considerations which principally weighed with the Commissioners in inducing them not to adopt the plan of taxation was, that they understood the Clergy in general to be decidedly averse to it; so that the plan of the Commission was, that the greater benefices should pay to the little, while the Bishops themselves—the Archbishop of Canterbury with his 15,000*l.* a year, and the Bishop of London with his 10,000*l.* a year—were not to subscribe a single farthing for that purpose. Why does John, Bishop of Lincoln, mention these distressing schemes of the Commission, which we are certain would have been met with a general yell of indignation from one end of the kingdom to another? Surely it must have occurred to this excellent Prelate that the Bishops would have been compelled by mere shame to have contributed to the fund which they were about to put upon the backs of the more opulent parochial clergy: surely a moment's reflection must have taught them that the safer method by far was to confiscate Cathedral property.

The idea of abandoning this taxation, because it was displeasing to the Clergy at large, is not unentertaining as applied to a commission who treated the Clergy with the greatest contempt, and did not even notice the Communications from Cathedral bodies upon the subject of the most serious and extensive confiscations.*

disgrace on the coast of Spain. If the amiable Lord Glenelg were to leave us, we should feel secure in our colonial possessions. If Mr. Spring Rice were to go into holy orders, great would be the joy of the three per cents. A decent good-looking head of the Government might easily enough be found in lieu of Viscount Melbourne; but in five minutes after the departure of Lord John, the whole Whig Government would be dissolved into sparks of liberality and splinters of Reform. There are six remarkable men, who, in different methods and in different degrees, are now affecting the interests of this country—the Duke of Wellington, Lord John Russell, Lord Brougham, Lord Lyndhurst, Sir Robert Peel, and O'Connell. Greater powers than all these are the phlegm of the English people—the great mass of good sense and intelligence diffused among them—and the number of those who have something to lose, and have not the slightest intention of losing it.

* Upon this subject I think it right to introduce the following letters, the first of which was published Jan. 23, 1838:—

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

"Sir,—I feel it to be consistent with my duty, as Secretary to the Church Commissioners, to notice a statement emanating from a quarter which would seem to give it authenticity—that, of seven Chapter memorials addressed to the Board, the receipt of one was only acknowledged.

"It is strictly within my province to acknowledge communications made to the

"The plan of taxation, therefore," says the Bishop, "being abandoned, it was evident that the funds for the augmentation of poor Livings, and for the supply of the spiritual wants of populous districts, must be drawn from the Episcopal and Cathedral revenues; that is, from the revenues from which the Legislature seems to have a peculiar right to draw the funds for the general supply of the religious wants of the people; because they arise from benefices, of which the patronage is either actually in the Crown, or is derivative from the Crown. In the case of the Episcopal revenues, the Commissioners had already carried the principle of re-distribution as far as they thought that it could, with due allowance for the various demands upon the incomes of the Bishops, be carried. The only remaining source, therefore, was to be found in the Cathedral Revenues: and the Commissioners proceeded, in the execution of the duties prescribed to them, to consider in what manner those revenues might be rendered conducive to the efficiency of the Established Church."

This is very good Episcopal reasoning; but is it true? The Bishops and Commissioners wanted a fund to endow small Livings; they did not touch a farthing of their own incomes, only distributed them a little more equally; and proceeded lustily at once to confiscate Cathedral property. But why was it necessary, if the fund for small Livings was such a paramount consideration, that the future Archbishops of Canterbury should be left with two palaces, and 15,000*l.* per annum? Why is every future Bishop of London to have a palace in Fulham, a house in St. James's Square, and 10,000*l.* a year? Could not all the Episcopal functions be carried on well and effectually with the half of these incomes?

Commissioners as a body, either directly or through me; and it is part of their general instructions to me that I should do so in all cases.

"To whatever extent, therefore, the statement may be true, or whatever may be its value, it is clear that it cannot attach to the Commissioners, but that I alone am responsible.

"In the execution of my office I have endeavoured, in the midst of my other duties, to conduct an extensive correspondence in accordance to what I knew to be the feelings and wishes of the Commissioners, and to treat every party in communication with them with attention and respect.

"If, at some period of more than usual pressure, any accidental omission may have occurred, or may hereafter occur, involving an appearance of discourtesy, it is for me to offer, as I now do, explanation and apology.

"I am, Sir, your obedient humble servant,
"C. K. MURRAY.

"Whitehall Place, Jan. 21."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

"Sir,—A more indiscreet and extraordinary communication than that which appears in your own paper of the 23rd instant, signed by Mr. C. K. Murray, I never read. '*Apparet domus intus.*' It is now clear how the Commission has been worked. Where communications from the oldest Ecclesiastical bodies, upon the most important of all subjects to them and to the kingdom, were received by the greatest prelates and noblemen of the land, acting under the King's Commission, I should have thought that answers suitable to the occasion would, in each case, have been dictated by the Commission; that such answers would have been entered on the minutes, and read on the Board-day next ensuing.

"Is Mr. C. K. Murray quite sure that this, which is done at all Boards on the most trifling subjects, was not done at his Board, in the most awful confiscations ever known in England? Is he certain that spoliation was in no instance sweetened by civility, and injustice never varnished by forms? Were all the decencies and proprieties which ought to regulate the intercourse of such great bodies left without a single inquiry from the Commissioner, to a gentleman who seems to have been seized with six distinct fits of oblivion on six separate occasions, any one of which required all that attention to decorum and that accuracy of memory for which secretaries are selected and paid?

"According to Mr. C. K. Murray's account, the only order he received from the Board was, 'If any Prebendary calls, or any Cathedral writes, desiring not to be destroyed, just say the communication has been received;' and even this, Mr. Murray tells us, he has not done, and that no one of the King's Commissioners—Archbishops, Bishops, Marquises, Earls—ever asked him whether he had done it or not—though any one of these great people would have swooned away at the idea of not answering the most trifling communication from any other of these great people.

"Whatever else these Commissioners do, they had better not bring their Secretary forward again. They may feel wind-bound by public opinion, but they must choose, as a sacrifice, a better Iphigenia than Mr. C. K. Murray. "SYDNEY SMITH."

Is it necessary that the Archbishop of Canterbury should give feasts to Aristocratic London; and that the domestics of the Prelacy should stand with swords and bag-wigs round pig, and turkey, and venison, to defend, as it were, the Orthodox gastronome from the fierce Unitarian, the fell Baptist, and all the famished children of Dissent? I don't object to all this; because I am sure that the method of prizes and blanks is the best method of supporting a Church which must be considered as very slenderly endowed, if the whole were equally divided among the parishes; but if my opinion were different—if I thought the important improvement was to equalise preferment in the English Church—that such a measure was not the one thing foolish, but the one thing needful—I should take care, as a mitred Commissioner, to reduce my own species of preferment to the narrowest limits, before I proceeded to confiscate the property of any other grade of the Church. I could not, as a conscientious man, leave the Archbishop of Canterbury with 15,000*l.* a year, and make a fund by annihilating Residentiaries at Bristol of 500*l.* This comes of calling a meeting of one species of cattle only. The horned cattle say, —"If you want any meat, kill the sheep; don't meddle with us, there is no beef to spare." They said this, however, to the lion; and the cunning animal, after he had gained all the information necessary for the destruction of the muttons, and learnt how well and widely they pastured, and how they could be most conveniently eaten up, turns round and informs the cattle, who took him for their best and tenderest friend, that he means to eat them up also. Frequently did Lord John meet the destroying Bishops; much did he commend their daily heap of ruins; sweetly did they smile on each other, and much charming talk was there of meteorology and catarrh, and the particular Cathedral they were pulling down at each time*; till one fine day the Home Secretary, with a voice more bland, and a look more ardently affectionate, than that which the masculine mouse bestows on his nibbling female, informed them that the Government meant to take all the Church property into their own hands, to pay the rates out of it, and deliver the residue to the rightful possessors. Such an effect, they say, was never before produced by a *coup de théâtre*. The Commission was separated in an instant: London clenched his fist; Canterbury was hurried out by his chaplains, and put into a warm bed; a solemn vacancy spread itself over the face of Gloucester; Lincoln was taken out in strong hysteries. What a noble scene Serjeant Talfourd would have made of this! Why are such talents wasted on *Ion* and the *Athenian Captive?*

But, after all, what a proposition! "You don't make the most of your money: I will take your property into my hands, and see if I cannot squeeze a penny out of it: you shall be regularly paid all you now receive, only if anything more can be made of it, that we will put into our own pockets."—"Just pull off your neckcloth, and lay your head under the guillotine, and I will promise not to do you any harm: just get ready for confiscation; give up the management of all your property; make us the ostensible managers of everything; let us be informed of the most minute value of all, and depend upon it, we will never injure you to the extent of a single farthing."—"Let me get my arms about you," says the bear, "I have not the smallest intention of squeezing you."—"Trust your finger in my mouth," says the mastiff, "I will not fetch blood."

Where is this to end? If Government are to take into their own hands all property which is not managed with the greatest sharpness and accuracy, they may squeeze 1-8th per cent. out of the Turkey Company; Spring Rice would become Director of the Hydro-impervious Association, and clear a few hundreds for the Treasury. The British Roasted Apple Society is notoriously mismanaged, and Lord John and Brother Lister, by a careful

* "What Cathedral are we pulling down to-day?" was the standing question at the Commission.

selection of fruit, and a judicious management of fuel, would soon get it up to par.

I think, however, I have heard at the Political Economy Club, where I have sometimes had the honour of being a guest, that no trades should be carried on by Governments. That they have enough to do of their own, without undertaking other persons' business. If any savings in the mode of managing Ecclesiastical Leases could be made, great deductions from the savings must be allowed by the jobbing and *Gaspillage* of general Boards, and all the old servants of the Church, displaced by this measure, must receive compensation.

The Whig Government, they will be vexed to hear, would find a great deal of patronage forced upon them by this measure. Their favourite human animal, the Barrister of six years' standing, would be called into action. The whole earth is, in fact, in commission, and the humam race saved from the Flood are delivered over to Barristers of six years' standing. The *onus probandi* now lies upon any man who says he is not a Commissioner; the only doubt on seeing a new man among the Whigs is, not whether he is a Commissioner or not, but whether it is Tithes, Poor Laws, Boundaries of Boroughs, Church Leases, Charities, or any of the thousand human concerns which are now worked by Commissioners, to the infinite comfort and satisfaction of mankind, who seem in these days to have found out the real secret of life—the one thing wanting to sublunary happiness—the great principle of Commission, and six years' Barristration.

Then, if there be a better method of working Ecclesiastical Estates — if anything can be gained for the Church —why is not the Church to have it? why is it not applied to Church purposes? what right has the State to seize it? If I give you an estate, I give it you not only in its present state, but I give to you all the improvements which can be made upon it — all that mechanical, botanical, and chemical knowledge, may do hereafter for its improvement — all the ameliorations which care and experience can suggest, in setting, improving, and collecting your rents. Can there be such miserable equivocation as to say —I leave you your property, but I do not leave to you all the improvements which your own wisdom, or the wisdom of your fellow-creatures, will enable you to make of your property? How utterly unworthy of a Whig government is such a distinction as this!

Suppose the same sort of plan had been adopted in the reign of Henry VIII., and the Legislature had said, — You shall enjoy all you now have, but every farthing of improved revenue, after this period, shall go into the pocket of the State — it would have been impossible by this time that the Church could have existed at all; and why may not such a measure be as fatal hereafter to the existence of a Church, as it would have been to the present generation, if it had been brought forward at the time of the Reformation?

There is some safety in dignity. A Church is in danger when it is degraded. It costs mankind much less to destroy it when an institution is associated with mean, and not with elevated, ideas. I should like to see the subject in the hands of H. B. I would entitle the print—

"The Bishops' Saturday Night; or, Lord John Russell at the Pay-Table."

The Bishops should be standing before the pay-table, and receiving their weekly allowance; Lord John and Spring Rice counting, ringing, and biting the sovereigns, and the Bishop of Exeter insisting that the Chancellor of the Exchequer has given him one which was not weight. Viscount Melbourne, in high chuckle, should be standing, with his hat on, and his back to the fire, delighted with the contest; and the Deans and Canons should be in the background, waiting till their turn came, and the Bishops were paid; and among them a Canon, of large composition, urging them on not to give way too much to the

Bench. Perhaps I should add the President of the Board of Trade, recommending the truck principle to the Bishops, and offering to pay them in hassocks, cassocks, aprons, shovel-hats, sermon-cases, and such like ecclesiastical gear.

But the madness and folly of such a measure is in the revolutionary feeling which it excites. A Government taking into its hands such an immense value of property! What a lesson of violence and change to the mass of mankind! Do you want to accustom Englishmen to lose all confidence in the permanence of their institutions — to inure them to great acts of plunder — and to draw forth all the latent villanies of human nature? The Whig leaders are honest men, and cannot mean this, but these foolish and inconsistent measures are the horn-book and infantile lessons of revolution; and remember, it requires no great time to teach mankind to rob and murder on a great scale.

I am astonished that these Ministers neglect the common precaution of a foolometer *, with which no public man should be unprovided: I mean, the acquaintance and society of three or four regular British fools as a test of public opinion. Every Cabinet minister should judge of all his measures by his foolometer, as a navigator crowds or shortens sail by the barometer in his cabin. I have a very valuable instrument of that kind myself, which I have used for many years; and I would be bound to predict, with the utmost nicety, by the help of this machine, the precise effect which any measure would produce on public opinion. Certainly, I never saw anything so decided as the effects produced upon my machine by the Rate Bill. No man who had been accustomed in the smallest degree to handle philosophical instruments could have doubted of the storm which was coming on, or of the thoroughly un-English scheme, in which the Ministry had so rashly engaged themselves.

I think, also, that it is a very sound argument against this measure of Church Rates, that estates have been bought liable to these payments, and that they have been deducted from the purchase money. And, what, also, if a Dissenter were a Republican as well as a Dissenter — a case which has sometimes happened; and what if our anti-monarchical Dissenter were to object to the expenses of kingly government? Are his scruples to be respected, and his taxes diminished, and the Queen's privy purse to be subjected and exposed to the intervening and economical squeeze of Government Commissioners?

But these lucubrations upon Church Rates are an episode; I must go back to John, Bishop of Lincoln. All other Cathedrals are fixed at four Prebendaries; St. Paul's and Lincoln having only three, are increased to the regulation pattern of four. I call this useless and childish. The Bishop of Lincoln says, there were more Residentiaries before the Reformation; but if for three hundred years three Residentiaries have been found to be sufficient, what a strangely feeble excuse it is for adding another, and diverting 3000*l.* per annum from the Small Living Fund, to say, that there were more Residentiaries three hundred years ago.

Must everything be good and right that is done by Bishops? Is there one rule of right for them, and another for the rest of the world? Now here are two Commissioners, whose express object is to constitute out of the large emoluments of the dignitaries, a Fund for the poorer Parochial Clergy; and in the very heat and fervour of confiscation, they build up two new places, utterly useless and uncalled for, take 3000*l.* from the Charity Fund to pay

* Mr. Fox very often used to say, "I wonder what Lord B. will think of this!" Lord B. happened to be a very stupid person, and the curiosity of Mr. Fox's friends was naturally excited to know why he attached such importance to the opinion of such an ordinary common-place person. "His opinion," said Mr. Fox, "is of much more importance than you are aware of. He is an exact representative of all common-place English prejudices, and what Lord B. thinks of any measure, the great majority of English people will think of it." It would be a good thing if every Cabinet of philosophers had a Lord B. among them.

them, and they give the patronage of these places to themselves. Is there a single epithet in the language of invective which would not have been levelled at Lay Commissioners who had attempted the same thing? If it be necessary to do so much for Archdeacons, why might not one of the three Residentiaries be Archdeacon in virtue of his Prebend? If Government make Bishops, they may surely be trusted to make Archdeacons. I am very willing to ascribe good motives to these Commissioners, who are really worthy and very sensible men, but I am perfectly astonished that they were not deterred from such a measure by appearances, and by the motives which, whether rightly or wrongly, would be imputed to them. In not acting so as to be suspected, the Bishop of London should resemble Cæsar's wife. In other respects, this excellent Prelate would not have exactly suited for the partner for that great and self-willed man; and an idea strikes me, that is not impossible he might have been in the Senate-house instead of Cæsar.

Lord John Russell gives himself great credit for not having confiscated Church property, but merely remodelled and redivided it. I accuse him not of plunder, but I accuse him of taking the Church of England, rolling it about as a cook does a piece of dough with a rolling-pin, cutting a hundred different shapes with all the plastic fertility of a confectioner, and without the most distant suspicion that he can ever be wrong, or ever be mistaken; with a certainty that he can anticipate the consequences of every possible change in human affairs. There is not a better man in England than Lord John Russell; but his worst failure is that he is utterly ignorant of all moral fear; there is nothing he would not undertake. I believe he would perform the operation for the stone — build St. Peter's — or assume (with or without ten minutes' notice) the command of the Channel Fleet; and no one would discover by his manner that the patient had died — the Church tumbled down — and the Channel Fleet been knocked to atoms. I believe his motives are always pure, and his measures often able; but they are endless, and never done with that pedetentous pace and pedetentous mind in which it behoves the wise and virtuous improver to walk. He alarms the wise Liberals; and it is impossible to sleep soundly while he has the command of the watch.*

Do not say, my dear Lord John, that I am too severe upon you. A thousand years have scarce sufficed to make our blessed England what it is; an hour may lay it in the dust: and can you with all your talents renovate its shattered splendour — can you recall back its virtues — can you vanquish time and fate? But, alas! you want to shake the world, and be the Thunderer of the scene!

Now what is the end of what I have written? Why everybody was in a great fright; and a number of Bishops, huddled together, and talking of their great sacrifices, began to destroy other people's property, and to take other people's patronage: and all the fright is over now; and all the Bishops are very sorry for what they have done, and regret extremely the destruction of the Cathedral dignitaries, but don't know how to get out of the foolish scrape. The Whig Ministry persevere to please Joseph and his brethren, and the Destroyers; and the good sense of the matter is to fling out the Dean and Chapter Bill, as it now stands, and to bring in another next year — making a fund out of all the Non-resident Prebends, annexing some of the others, and adopting many of the enactments contained in the present Bill.

* Another peculiarity of the Russells is, that they never alter their opinions: they are an excellent race, but they must be trepanned before they can be convinced.

THIRD LETTER

TO

ARCHDEACON SINGLETON.

My dear Sir,

I hope this is the last letter you will receive from me on Church matters. I am tired of the subject; so are you; so is everybody. In spite of many Bishops' charges, I am unbroken; and remain entirely of the same opinion as I was two or three years since—that the mutilation of Deans and Chapters is a rash, foolish, and imprudent measure.

I do not think the charge of the Bishop of London successful, in combating those arguments which have been used against the impending Dean and Chapter Bill; but it is quiet, gentlemanlike, temperate, and written in a manner which entirely becomes the high office and character which he bears.

I agree with him in saying that the Plurality and Residence Bill is, upon the whole, a very good Bill;—nobody, however, knows better than the Bishop of London the various changes it has undergone, and the improvements it has received. I could point out fourteen or fifteen very material alterations for the better since it came out of the hands of the Commission, and all *bearing materially upon the happiness and comfort of the parochial Clergy.* I will mention only a few:—the Bill, as originally introduced, gave the Bishop a power, when he considered the duties of the parish to be improperly performed, to suspend the Clergyman and appoint a Curate with a salary. Some impious person thought it not impossible that occasionally such a power might be maliciously and vindictively exercised, and that some check to it should be admitted into the Bill; accordingly, under the existing act, an Ecclesiastical Jury is to be summoned, and into that jury the defendant Clergyman may introduce a friend of his own.

If a Clergyman, from illness or any other overwhelming necessity, were prevented from having two services, he was exposed to an information, and penalty. In answering the Bishop, he was subjected to two opposite sets of penalties—the one for saying *Yes;* the other for saying *No:* he was amenable to the needless and impertinent scrutiny of a Rural Dean before he was exposed to the scrutiny of the Bishop. Curates might be forced upon him by subscribing parishioners, and the certainty of a schism established in the parish; a Curate might have been forced upon *present* incumbents by the Bishop without any complaint made; upon men who took, or, perhaps, bought, their livings under very different laws;—all these acts of injustice are done away with, but it is not to the *credit* of the framers of the Bill that they were ever admitted, and they completely justify the opposition with which the Bill was received by me and by others. I add, however, with great pleasure, that when these and other objections were made, they were heard with candour, and promised to be remedied by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London and Lord John Russell.

I have spoken of the power to issue a Commission to inquire into the well-being of any parish: a vindictive and malicious Bishop might, it is true, convert this, which was intended for the protection, to the oppression of the Clergy—afraid to dispossess a Clergyman of his own authority, he might attempt to do the same thing under the cover of a jury of his ecclesiastical creatures. But I can hardly conceive such baseness in the prelate, or such infamous subserviency in the agents. An honest and respectable Bishop will remember that the very issue of such a Commission is a serious slur upon the character of a Clergyman; he will do all he can to prevent it by private monition and remonstrance; and if driven to such an act of power, he will of course state to the accused Clergyman the subjects of accusation, the names of his accusers, and give him ample time for his defence. If upon anonymous accusation he subjects a Clergyman to such an investigation, or refuses to him any advantage which the law gives to every accused person, he is an infamous, degraded, and scandalous tyrant: but I cannot believe there is such a man to be found upon the Bench.

There is in this new Bill a very humane clause (though not introduced by the Commission), enabling the widow of the diseased clergyman to retain possession of the parsonage house for two months after the death of the Incumbent. It ought, in fairness, to be extended to the heirs, executors, and administrators of the Incumbent. It is a great hardship that a family settled in a parish for fifty years perhaps, should be torn up by the roots in eight or ten days; and the interval of two months, allowing time for repairs, might put to rest many questions of dilapidation.

To the Bishop's power of intruding a Curate without any complaint on the part of the parish that the duty has been inadequately performed, I retain the same objections as before. It is a power which without this condition will be unfairly and partially exercised. The first object I admit is not the provision of the Clergyman, but the care of the parish: but one way of taking care of parishes is to take care that clergymen are not treated with tyranny, partiality, and injustice: and the best way of effecting this is to remember that their superiors have the same human passions as other people; and not to trust them with a power which may be so grossly abused, and which (incredible as the Bishop of London may deem it) *has been*, in some instances, grossly abused.

I cannot imagine what the Bishop means by saying, that the members of Cathedrals do not in virtue of their office bear any part in the parochial instruction of the people. This is a fine deceitful word, the word *parochial*, and eminently calculated to coax the public. If he means simply that Cathedrals do not belong to parishes, that St. Paul's is not the parish church of Upper Puddicomb, and that the Vicar of St. Fiddlefrid does not officiate in Westminster Abbey: all this is true enough, but do they not in the most material points instruct the people precisely in the same manner as the parochial Clergy? Are not prayers and sermons the most important means of spiritual instruction? And are there not eighteen or twenty services in every Cathedral for one which is heard in parish churches? I have very often counted in the afternoon of week days in St. Paul's 150 people, and on Sundays it is full to suffocation. Is all this to go for nothing? and what right has the Bishop of London to suppose that there is not as much real piety in Cathedrals, as in the most roadless, postless, melancholy, sequestered hamlet, preached to by the most provincial, sequestered, bucolic Clergyman in the Queen's dominions?

A number of little children, it is true, do not repeat a catechism of which they do not comprehend a word; but it is rather rapid and wholesale to say, that the parochial Clergy are spiritual instructors of the people, and that the Cathedral Clergy are only so in a very restricted sense. I say that in the most material points and acts of instruction, they are much more labo-

rious and incessant than any parochial Clergy. It might really be supposed from the Bishop of London's reasoning, that some other methods of instruction took place in Cathedrals than prayers and sermons can afford; that lectures were read on chemistry, or lessons given on dancing; or that it was a Mechanics' Institute, or a vast receptacle for hexameter and pentameter boys. His own most respectable Chaplain, who is often there as a member of the body, will tell him that the prayers are strictly adhered to, according to the rubric, with the difference only that the service is beautifully chanted instead of being badly read; that instead of the atrocious bawling of parish Churches, the Anthems are sung with great taste and feeling; and if the preaching is not good, it is the fault of the Bishop of London, who has the whole range of London preachers from whom to make his selection. The real fact is, that, instead of being something materially different from the parochial Clergy, as the Commissioners wish to make them, the Cathedral Clergy are fellow labourers with the parochial Clergy, outworking them ten to one; but the Commission having provided snugly for the Bishops, have by *the merest accident in the world* entangled themselves in this quarrel with Cathedrals.

"Had the question," says the Bishop, "been proposed to the religious part of the community, Whether, if no other means were to be found, the effective cure of souls should be provided for by the total suppression of those Ecclesiastical Corporations which have no cure of souls, nor bear any part in the parochial labours of the Clergy; that question, I verily believe, would have been carried in the affirmative by an immense majority of suffrages." But suppose no other means could be found for the effective cure of souls than the suppression of Bishops, does the Bishop of London imagine that the majority of suffrages would have been less immense? How idle to put such cases!

A pious man leaves a large sum of money in Catholic times for some purposes which are superstitious, and for others, such as preaching and reading prayers, which are applicable to all times; the superstitious usages are abolished, the pious usages remain: now the Bishop must admit, if you take half or any part of this money from Clergymen to whom it was given, and divide it for similar purposes among Clergy to whom it was not given, you deviate materially from the intentions of the founder. These foundations are made *in loco;* in many of them the *locus* was perhaps the original cause of the gift. A man who founds an almshouse at Edmonton does not mean that the poor of Tottenham should avail themselves of it; and if he could have anticipated such a consequence, he would not have endowed any almshouse at all. Such is the respect for property that the Court of Chancery, when it becomes impracticable to carry the will of the donor into execution, always attend to the *cy pres*, and apply the charitable fund to a purpose as germane as possible to the intention of the founder; but here, when men of Lincoln have left to Lincoln Cathedral, and men of Hereford, to Hereford, the Commissioners seize it all, melt it into a common mass, and disperse it over the kingdom. Surely the Bishop of London cannot contend that this is not a greater deviation from the will of the founder than if the same people remaining in the same place, receiving all the founder gave them, and doing all things not forbidden by the law which the founder ordered, were to do something more than the founder ordered, were to become the guardians of education, the counsel to the Bishop, and the Curators of the Diocese in his old age and decay.

The public are greater robbers and plunderers than any one in the public; look at the whole transaction, it is a mixture of meanness and violence. The country choose to have an established religion, and a resident parochial Clergy, but they do not choose to build houses for their parochial clergy, or to pay them in many instances more than a butler or a coachman receives. How is this deficiency to be supplied? The heads of

the Church propose to this public to seizeupon estates which never belonged to the public, and which were left for another purpose ; and by the seizure of these estates to save that which ought to come out of the public purse.

Suppose Parliament were to seize upon all the alms-houses in England, and apply them to the diminution of the poor-rate, what a number of ingenious arguments might be pressed into the service of this robbery : "Can anything be more revolting than that the poor of Northumberland should be starving, while the poor of the suburban hamlets are dividing the benefactions of the pious dead ? '*We want for these purposes all that we can obtain from whatever sources derived.*'" I do not deny the right of Parliament to do this, or anything else ; but I deny that it would be expedient ; because I think it better to make any sacrifices, and to endure any evil, than to gratify this rapacious spirit of plunder and confiscation. Suppose these Commissioner Prelates, firm and unmoved, when we were all alarmed, had told the public that the parochial Clergy were badly provided for, and that it was the duty of that public to provide a proper support for their Ministers ; — suppose the Commissioners, instead of leading them on to confiscation, had warned their fellow subjects against the base economy, and the perilous injustice of seizing on that which was not their own ; — suppose they had called for water and washed their hands, and said, "We call you all to witness that we are innocent of this great ruin ;" — does the Bishop of London imagine that the Prelates who made such a stand would have gone down to posterity less respected and less revered than those men upon whose tombs it must (after all the enumerations of their virtues) be written, *that under their auspices and by their counsels the destruction of the English Church began?* Pity that the Archbishop of Canterbury had not retained those feelings, when, at the first meeting of Bishops, the Bishop of London proposed this *holy innovation* upon Cathedrals, and the head of our Church declared with vehemence and indignation that nothing in the earth would induce him to consent to it.

> Si mens non læva fuisset,
> Trojaque nunc stares, Priamique arx alta maneres.

"But," says the Lord Bishop of London, "you admit the principle of confiscation by proposing the confiscation and partition of Prebends in the possession of non-residents." I am thinking of something else, and I see all of a sudden a great blaze of light : I behold a great number of gentlemen in short aprons, neat purple coats, and gold buckles, rushing about with torches in their hands, calling each other "My Lord," and setting fire to all the rooms in the house, and the people below delighted with the combustion : finding it impossible to turn them from their purpose, and finding that they are all what they are, by divine permission ; I endeavour to direct their *holy innovations* into another channel ; and I say to them, "My Lords, had not you better set fire to the out of door offices, to the barns and stables, and spare this fine library and this noble drawing-room ? Yonder are several cow-houses of which no use is made ; pray direct your fury against them, and leave this beautiful and venerable mansion as you found it." If I address the divinely permitted in this manner, has the Bishop of London any right to call me a brother incendiary ?

Our *holy innovator*, the Bishop of London, has drawn a very affecting picture of *sheep having no shepherd*, and of millions who have no *spiritual food* : our wants, he says, are most imperious ; even if we were to tax large Livings we must still have the money of the Cathedrals : no plea will exempt you, nothing can stop us, for the formation of benefices, and the endowment of new ones. We want (and he prints it in italics) for these purposes "*all that we can obtain from whatever sources derived.*" I never remember to have been more alarmed in my life than by this passage. I said to myself, the necessities of the Church have got such complete hold of the imagination of this energetic Prelate, who is so captivated

by the holiness of his innovations, that all grades and orders of the Church and all present and future interests will be sacrificed to it. I immediately rushed to the acts of Parliament which I always have under my pillow to see at once the worst of what had happened. I found present revenues of the Bishops all safe; that is some comfort, I said to myself: Canterbury, 24,000*l.* or 25,000*l.* per annum; London, 18,000*l.* or 20,000*l.* I began to feel some comfort: "things are not so bad; the Bishops do not mean to sacrifice to *sheep and shepherd's money* their present revenues; the Bishop of London is less violent and headstrong than I thought he would be." I looked a little further, and found that 15,000*l.* per annum is allotted to the future Archbishop of Canterbury, 10,000*l.* to the Bishop of London, 8000*l.* to Durham, and 8000*l.* each to Winchester and Ely. "Nothing of *sheep and shepherd* in all this," I exclaimed, and felt still more comforted. It was not till after the Bishops were taken care of, and the revenues of the Cathedrals came into full view, that I saw the perfect development of the *sheep and shepherd principle*, the deep and heartfelt compassion for spiritual labourers, and that inward groaning for the destitute state of the Church, and that firm purpose, printed in italics, of taking *for these purposes all that could be obtained from whatever source derived;* and even in this delicious rummage of Cathedral property, where all the fine church feelings of the Bishop's heart could be indulged without costing the poor sufferer a penny, stalls for Archdeacons in Lincoln and St. Paul's are, to the amount of 2000*l.* per annum, taken from the *sheep and shepherd fund*, and the patronage of them divided between two commissioners, the Bishop of London and the Bishop of Lincoln, instead of being paid to additional *labourers in the Vineyard.*

Has there been any difficulty, I would ask, in procuring Archdeacons upon the very moderate pay they now receive? Can any Clergyman be more thoroughly respectable than the present Archdeacons in the see of London? but men bearing such an office in the Church, it may be said, should be highly paid, and Archbishops who could very well keep up their dignity upon 7000*l.* per annum, are to be allowed 15,000*l.* I make no objection to all this; but then what becomes of all these heart-rending phrases of *sheep and shepherd, and drooping vineyards, and flocks without spiritual consolation?* The Bishop's argument is, that the superfluous must give way to the necessary; but in fighting, the Bishop should take great care that his cannons are not seized, and turned against himself. He has awarded to the Bishops of England a superfluity as great as that which he intends to take from the Cathedrals; and then, when he legislates for an order to which he does not belong, begins to remember the distresses of the lower Clergy, paints them with all the colours of impassioned eloquence, and informs the Cathedral institutions that he must have *every farthing he can lay his hand upon.* Is not this as if one affected powerfully by a charity sermon were to put his hands in another man's pocket, and cast, from what he had extracted, a liberal contribution into the plate?

I beg not to be mistaken; I am very far from considering the Bishop of London as a sordid and interested person; but this is a complete instance of how the best of men deceive themselves, where their interests are concerned. I have no doubt the Bishop firmly imagined he was doing his duty; but there should have been men of all grades in the Commission, some one to say a word for Cathedrals and against Bishops.

The Bishop says, "his antagonists have allowed three Canons to be sufficient for St. Paul's, and therefore four must be sufficient for other Cathedrals." Sufficient to read the prayers and preach the sermons, certainly, and so would *one* be; but not sufficient to excite by the hope of increased rank and wealth eleven thousand parochial Clergy.

The most important and cogent arguments against the Dean and Chapter confiscations are passed over in

silence in the Bishop's Charge. This, in reasoning, is always the wisest and most convenient plan, and which all young Bishops should imitate after the manner of this wary polemic. I object to the confiscation *because it will throw a great deal more of capital out of the parochial Church than it will bring into it.* I am very sorry to come forward with so homely an argument, which shocks so many Clergymen, and particularly those with the largest incomes, and the best Bishoprics; but the truth is, the greater number of Clergymen go into the Church in order that they may derive a comfortable income *from* the Church. Such men intend to do their duty, and they do it; but the duty is, however, not the motive, but the adjunct. If I were writing in gala and parade, I would not hold this language; but we are in earnest, and on business; and as very rash and hasty changes are founded upon contrary suppositions of the pure disinterestedness and perfect inattention to temporals in the Clergy, we must get down at once to the solid rock, without heeding how we disturb the turf and the flowers above. The parochial Clergy maintain their present decent appearance quite as much by their own capital as by the income they derive from the Church. I will now state the income and capital of seven Clergymen, taken promiscuously in this neighbourhood:—

No. 1. Living 200*l.*, Capital 12,000*l.*;
No. 2. Living 800*l.*, Capital 15,000*l.*;
No. 3. Living 500*l.*, Capital 12,000*l.*;
No. 4. Living 150*l.*, Capital 10,000*l.*;
No. 5. Living 800*l.*, Capital 12,000*l.*;
No. 6. Living 150*l.*, Capital 1000*l.*;
No. 7. Living 600*l.*, Capital 16,000*l.*

I have diligently inquired into the circumstances of seven Unitarian and Wesleyan ministers, and I question much if the whole seven could make up 6000*l.* between them; and the zeal and enthusiasm of this last division is certainly not inferior to that of the former. Now here is a capital of 72,000*l.* carried into the Church, which the confiscations of the Commissioners would force out of it, by taking away the good things which were the temptation to its introduction. So that by the old plan of paying by lottery, instead of giving a proper competence to each, not only do you obtain a parochial Clergy upon much cheaper terms; but from the gambling propensities of human nature, and the irresistible tendency to hope that they shall gain the great prizes, you tempt men into your service who keep up their credit, and yours, not by your allowance, but by their own capital; and to destroy this wise and well-working arrangement, a great number of Bishops, Marquises, and John Russells, are huddled into a chamber, and after proposing a scheme which will turn the English Church into a collection of consecrated beggars, we are informed by the Bishop of London that it is a *Holy Innovation.*

I have no manner of doubt, that the immediate effect of passing the Dean and Chapter Bill will be, that a great number of fathers and uncles, judging, and properly judging, that the Church is a very altered and deteriorated profession, will turn the industry and capital of their *élèves* into another channel. My friend, Robert Eden, says, "This is of the earth earthy:" be it so; I cannot help it, I paint mankind as I find them, and am not answerable for their defects. When an argument taken from real life, and the actual condition of the world, is brought among the shadowy discussions of Ecclesiastics, it always occasions terror and dismay; it is like Æneas stepping into Charon's boat, which carried only ghosts and spirits.

Gemuit sub pondere cymba
Sutilis.

The whole plan of the Bishop of London is a ptochogony — a generation of beggars. He purposes, out of the spoils of the Cathedral, to create a thousand livings, and to give to the thousand Clergymen 130*l.* per annum each: a Christian Bishop proposing, in cold blood, to create a thousand livings of 130*l.* per annum each; — to call into existence a thousand of the most unhappy men on the face of the earth, — the sons of the poor, without

hope, without the assistance of private fortune, chained to the soil, ashamed to live with their inferiors, unfit for the society of the better classes, and dragging about the English curse of poverty, without the smallest hope that they can ever shake it off. At present such livings are filled by young men who have better hopes — who have reason to expect good property — who look forward to a college or a family living — who are the sons of men of some substance, and hope so to pass on to something better — who exist under the delusion of being hereafter Deans and Prebendaries — who are paid once by money, and three times by hope. Will the Bishop of London promise to the progeny of any of these thousand victims of the *Holy Innovation* that, if they behave well, one of them shall have his butler's place; another take care of the cedars and hyssops of his garden? Will he take their daughters for his nursery-maids? and may some of the sons of these "labourers of the vineyard" hope one day to ride the leaders from St. James's to Fulham? Here is hope — here is room for ambition — a field for genius, and a ray of amelioration! If these beautiful feelings of compassion are throbbing under the cassock of the Bishop, he ought in common justice to himself to make them known.

If it were a scheme for giving ease and independence to any large bodies of Clergymen, it might be listened to; but the revenues of the English Church are such as to render this wholly and entirely out of the question. If you place a man in a village in the country, require that he should be of good manners and well educated; that his habits and appearance should be above those of the farmers to whom he preaches, if he has nothing else to expect (as would be the case in a Church of equal division); and if upon his village income he is to support a wife and educate a family without any power of making himself known in a remote and solitary situation, such a person ought to receive 500*l.* per annum, and be furnished with a house. There are about 10,700 parishes in England and Wales, whose average income is 285*l.* per annum. Now, to provide these incumbents with decent houses, to keep them in repair, and to raise the income of the incumbent to 500*l.* per annum, would require (if all the incomes of the Bishops, Deans and Chapters of separate dignitaries, of sinecure rectories, were confiscated, and if the excess of all the livings in England above 500*l.* per annum were added to them) a sum of two millions and a half in addition to the present income of the whole Church; and no power on earth could persuade the present Parliament of Great Britain to grant a single shilling for that purpose. Now, is it possible to pay such a Church upon any other principle than that of unequal division? The proposed pillage of the Cathedral and College Churches (omitting all consideration of the separate estate of dignitaries) would amount, divided among all the Benefices in England to about 5*l.* 12*s.* 6½*d.* per man: and this, which would not stop an hiatus in a cassock, and would drive out of the parochial Church ten times as much as it brought into it, is the panacea for pauperism recommended by Her Majesty's Commissioners.

But if this plan were to drive men of capital out of the Church, and to pauperise the English clergy, where would the harm be? Could not all the duties of religion be performed as well by poor Clergymen as by men of good substance? My great and serious apprehension is, that such would not be the case. There would be the greatest risk that your Clergy would be fanatical, and ignorant; that their habits would be low and mean, and that they would be despised.

Then a picture is drawn of a Clergyman with 130*l.* per annum, who combines all moral, physical, and intellectual advantages, a learned man, dedicating himself intensely to the care of his parish — of charming manners and dignified deportment — six feet two inches high, beautifully proportioned, with a magnificent countenance, expressive of all the cardinal virtues and the Ten Commandments,

—and it is asked with an air of triumph if such a man as this will fall into contempt on account of his poverty? But substitute for him an average, ordinary, uninteresting Minister; obese, dumpy, neither ill-natured nor good-natured; neither learned nor ignorant, striding over the stiles to Church, with a second-rate wife—dusty and deliquescent—and four parochial children, full of catechism and bread and butter; or let him be seen in one of those Shem-Ham-and-Japhet buggies—made on Mount Ararat soon after the subsidence of the waters, driving in the High Street of Edmonton*;—among all his pecuniary, saponaceous, oleaginous parishioners. Can any man of common sense say that all these outward circumstances of the Ministers of religion have no bearing on religion itself?

I ask the Bishop of London, a man of honour and conscience as he is, if he thinks five years will elapse before a second attack is made upon Deans and Chapters? Does he think, after Reformers have tasted the flesh of the Church, that they will put up with any other diet? Does he forget that Deans and Chapters are but mock turtle—that more delicious delicacies remain behind? Five years hence he will attempt to make a stand, and he will be laughed at and eaten up. In this very charge the Bishop accuses the Lay Commissioners of another intended attack upon the property of the Church, contrary to the clearest and most explicit stipulations (as he says) with the heads of the Establishment.

Much is said of the conduct of the Commissioners, but that is of the least possible consequence. They may have acted for the best, according to the then existing circumstances; they may seriously have intended to do their duty to the country; and I am far from saying or thinking they did not; but without the least reference to the Commissioners, the question is, Is it wise to pass this bill, and to justify such an open and tremendous sacrifice of Church property? Does public opinion *now* call for any such measure? is it a wise distribution of the funds of an ill-paid Church? and will it not force more capital out of the parochial part of the Church than it brings into it? If the bill be bad, it is surely not to pass out of compliment to the feelings of the Archbishop of Canterbury. If the project be hasty, it is not to be adopted to gratify the Bishop of London. The mischief to the Church is surely a greater evil than the stultification of the Commissioners, &c. If the physician have prescribed hastily, is the medicine to be taken to the death or disease of the patient? If the judge have condemned improperly, is the criminal to be hung, that the wisdom of the magistrate may not be impugned?*

But, why are the Commissioners to be stultified by the rejection of the measure? The measure may have been very good when it was recommended, and very objectionable now. I thought, and many men though, that the Church was going to pieces—that the affections of the common people were lost to the Establishment; and that large sacrifices must be instantly made, to avert the effects of this temporary madness; but those days are gone by—and with them ought to be put aside measures which might have been wise in those days, but are wise no longer.

After all, the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London are good and placable men; and will ere long forget and forgive the successful efforts of their enemies in defeating this mis-ecclesiastic law.

Suppose the Commission were now beginning to sit for the first time, will any man living say that they would make such reports as they have made? and that they would seriously propose such a tremendous revolution in Church property? And if they would not, the inference is irresistible, that to consult the feelings of two or three Churchmen, we are compliment-

* A parish which the Bishop of London has the greatest desire to divide into little bits; but which appears quite as fit to preserve its integrity as St. James's, St. George's, or Kensington, all in the patronage of the Bishop.

* "After the trouble the Commissioners have taken (says Sir Robert), after the obloquy they have incurred," &c. &c. &c.

ing away the safety of the Church. Milton asked where the nymphs were when Lycidas perished? I ask where the Bishops are when the remorseless deep is closing over the head of their beloved Establishment?*

You must have read an attack upon me by the Bishop of Gloucester, in the course of which he says that I have not been appointed to my situation as Canon of St. Paul's for my piety and learning, but because I am a scoffer and a jester. Is not this rather strong for a Bishop, and does it not appear to you, Mr. Archdeacon, as rather too close an imitation of that language which is used in the apostolic occupation of traffieking in fish? Whether I have been appointed for my piety or not, must depend upon what this poor man means by piety. He means by that word, of course, a defence of all the tyrannical and oppressive abuses of the Church which have been swept away within the last fifteen or twenty years of my life; the Corporation and Test Acts; the Penal Laws against the Catholics; the Compulsory Marriages of Dissenters, and all those disabling and disqualifying laws which were the disgrace of our Church, and which he has always looked up to as the consummation of human wisdom. If piety consisted in the defence of these — if it was impious to struggle for their abrogation, I have indeed led an ungodly life.

There is nothing pompous gentlemen are so much afraid of as a little humour. It is like the objection of certain cephalic animalcula to the use of small-tooth combs, "Finger and thumb, precipitate powder, or anything else you please; but for heaven's sake no small-tooth combs!" After all, I believe, Bishop Monk has been the cause of much more laughter than ever I have been; I cannot account for it, but I never see him enter a room without exciting a smile on every countenance within it.

* What is the use of publishing separate charges, as the Bishops of Winchester, Oxford, and Rochester have done? Why do not the dissentient Bishops form into a firm phalanx to save the Church and fling out the Bill?

Dr. Monk is furious at my attacking the heads of the Church; but how can I help it? If the heads of the Church are at the head of the Mob; if I find the best of men doing that, which has in all times drawn upon the worst enemies of the human race the bitterest curses of History, am I to stop because the motives of these men are pure, and their lives blameless? I wish I could find a blot in their lives, or a vice in their motives. The whole power of the motion is in the character of the movers: feeble friends, false friends, and foolish friends, all cease to look into the measure, and say, Would such a measure have been recommended by such men as the Prelates of Canterbury and London, if it were not for the public advantage? And in this way, the great good of a religious establishment, now rendered moderate and compatible with all men's liberties and rights, is sacrificed to names; and the Church destroyed from good breeding and Etiquette! the real truth is, that Canterbury and London have been frightened — they have overlooked the effect of time and delay — they have been betrayed into a fearful and ruinous mistake. Painful as it is to teach men who ought to teach us, the legislature ought, while there is yet time, to awake and read them this lesson.

It is dangerous for a Prelate to write; and whoever does it, ought to be a very wise one. He has speculated why I was made a Canon of St. Paul's. Suppose I were to follow his example, and, going through the bench of Bishops, were to ask for what reason each man had been made a Bishop; suppose I were to go into the county of Gloucester, &c. &c. &c. ! ! ! ! !

I was afraid the Bishop would attribute my promotion to the Edinburgh Review; but upon the subject of promotion by Reviews he preserves an impenetrable silence. If my excellent patron Earl Grey had any reasons of this kind, he may at least be sure that the reviews commonly attributed to me were really written *by* me. I should have considered myself as the lowest of created beings to have disguised myself in another man's wit, and to

have received a reward to which I was not entitled.*

I presume that what has drawn upon me the indignation of this Prelate, is the observations I have from time to time made on the conduct of the Commissioners; of which he positively asserts himself to have been a member; but whether he was, or was not a member, I utterly acquit him of all possible blame, and of every species of imputation which may attach to the conduct of the Commission. In using that word, I have always meant the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of London, and Lord John Russell; and have, honestly speaking, given no more heed to the Bishop of Gloucester, than if he had been sitting in a Commission of Bonzes in the Court of Pekin.

To read, however, his Lordship a lesson of good manners, I had prepared for him a chastisement which would have been echoed from the *Seagrave* who banqueteth in the castle, to the idiot who spitteth over the bridge at Gloucester; but the following appeal struck my eye, and stopped my pen: — "Since that time my inadequate qualifications have sustained an appalling diminution by the affection of my eyes, which have impaired my vision, and the progress of which threatens to consign me to darkness: I beg the benefit of your prayers to the Father of all mercies, that he will restore to me the better use of the visual organs, to be employed on his service; or that he will inwardly illumine the intellectual vision, with a particle of that Divine ray, which his Holy Spirit can alone impart."

It might have been better taste, perhaps, if a mitred invalid, in describing his bodily infirmities before a church full of Clergymen, whose prayers he asked, had been a little more sparing in the abuse of his enemies; but a good deal must be forgiven to the sick. I wish that every Christian was as well aware as this poor Bishop of what he needed from Divine assistance; and in the supplication for the restoration of his sight and the improvement of his understanding, I most fervently and cordially join.

I was much amused with what old Hermann* says of the Bishop of London's Æschylus. "We find," he says, "*a great arbitrariness of proceeding, and much boldness of innovation, guided by no sure principle;*" here it is: *qualis ab incepto.* He begins with Æschylus, and ends with the Church of England; begins with profane and ends with holy innovations— scratching out old readings which every commentator had sanctioned; abolishing ecclesiastical dignities which every reformer had spared; thrusting an anapæst into a verse, which will not bear it; and intruding a Canon into a Cathedral, which does not want it; and this is the Prelate by whom the proposed reform of the Church has been principally planned, and to whose practical wisdom the Legislature is called upon to defer. The Bishop of London is a man of very great ability, humane, placable, generous, munificent; very agreeable, but not to be trusted with great interests where calmness and judgment are required; unfortunately, my old and amiable school-fellow, the Archbishop of Canterbury, has melted away before him, and sacrificed that wisdom on which we all founded our security.

Much writing and much talking are very tiresome; and, above all, they are so to men who, living in the world, arrive at those rapid and just conclusions which are only to be made by living in the world. This bill past, every man of sense acquainted with human affairs must see, that as far as the Church is concerned, the

* I understand that the Bishop bursts into tears every now and then, and says that I have set him the name of Simon, and that all the Bishops now call him Simon. Simon of Gloucester, however, after all, is a real writer, and how could I know that Dr. Monk's name was Simon? When tutor in Lord Carrington's family, he was called by the endearing though somewhat unmajestic name of *Dick;* and if I had thought about his name at all, I should have called him Richard of Gloucester.

* Ueber die Behandlung der Griechischen Dichter bei den Engländern. Von Gottfried Hermann. Wiemar Jahrbucher, vol. liv. 1831.

thing is at an end. From Lord John Russell, the present improver of the Church, we shall descend to Hume, from Hume to Roebuck, and after Roebuck we shall receive our last improvements from Dr. Wade: plunder will follow after plunder, degradation after degradation. The Church is gone, and what remains is not life, but sickness, spasm, and struggle.

Whatever happens, I am not to blame; I have fought my fight. — Farewell.

SYDNEY SMITH.

A LETTER

TO

LORD JOHN RUSSELL.

MY LORD,

THOUGH, upon the whole, your Residence and Plurality Bill is a good Bill, and although I think it (thanks to your kind attention to the suggestions of various Clergymen) a much better Bill than that of last year, there are still some important defects in it, which deserve amendment and correction.

Page 13. *Sect.* 31.—It would seem, from this Section, that the repairs are to depend upon the will of the Bishop and not upon the present law of the land. A Bishop enters into the house of a non-resident Clergyman, and finds it neither papered, nor painted—he orders these decorative repairs. In the meantime the Court of Queen's Bench have decided that substantial repairs only, and not decorative repairs, can be recovered by an Incumbent from his predecessor: the following words should be added: —"Provided always, that no other repairs shall be required by the Bishop, than such as any Incumbent could recover as dilapidations from the person preceding him in the said Benefice."

Page 19. *Sect.* 42.—Incumbents are to answer questions transmitted by the Bishop, and these are to be countersigned by the rural Dean. This is another vexation to the numerous catalogue of vexations entailed upon the rural Clergy. Is every man to go before the rural Dean, twenty or thirty miles off, perhaps? Is he to go through a cross-examination by the rural Dean, as to the minute circumstances of twenty or thirty questions, to enter into reasonings upon them, and to produce witnesses? This is a most degrading and vexatious enactment, if all this be intended; but if the rural Dean is to believe the assertion of every Clergyman upon his word only, why may not a Bishop do so? and what is gained by the enactment? But the Commissioners seem to have been a set of Noblemen and Gentlemen, who met once a week to see how they could harass the working Clergy, and how they could make everything smooth and pleasing to the Bishops.

The clause for holding two Livings, at the interval of ten miles, is perfectly ridiculous. If you are to abolish Pluralities, do it at once, or leave a man only in possession of such Benefices as he can serve himself; and then the distance should be two miles, and not a yard more.

But common justice requires that there should be exceptions to your rules. For two hundred years Pluralities,

within certain distances, have been allowed: acting under the faith of these laws, Livings have been bought and bequeathed to Clergymen, tenable with other preferments in their possession — upon faith in these laws, men and women have married — educated their children — laid down a certain plan of life, and adopted a certain rate of expense, and ruin comes upon them in a moment, from this thoughtless inattention to existing interests. I know a man whose father dedicated all he had saved in a long life of retail trade, to purchase the next presentation to a living of 800*l.* per annum, tenable under the old law, with another of 500*l.* given to the son by his college. The whole of this Clergyman's life and prospects (and he has an immense family of children) are cut to pieces by your Bill. It is a wrong thing, you will say, to hold two Livings; I think it is, but why did not you, the Legislature, find this out fifty years ago? Why did you entice this man into the purchase of Pluralities, by a venerable laxity of two hundred years, and then clap him into gaol from the new virtue of yesterday? Such reforms as these make wisdom and carefulness useless, and turn human life into a mere scramble.

Page 32. *Sect.* 69.—There are the strongest possible objections to this clause. The Living is 410*l.* per annum, the population above 2000 — perhaps, as is often the case, one third of them Dissenters. A Clergyman does his duty in the most exemplary manner — dedicates his life to his parish, from whence he derives his whole support — there is not the shadow of a complaint against him. The Bishop has, by this clause, acquired a right of thrusting a Curate upon the Rector at the expense of a fifth part of his whole fortune. This, I think, an abominable piece of tyranny; and it will turn out to be an inexhaustible source of favouritism and malice. In the Bishops' Bill I have in vain looked for a similar clause, — "That if the population is above 800,000, and the income amounts to 10,000*l.*, an Assistant to the Bishop may be appointed by the Commissioners, and a salary of 2000*l.* per annum allotted to him." This would have been honest and manly, to have begun with the great people.

But mere tyranny and episcopal malice is not the only evil of this clause, nor the greatest evil. Everybody knows the extreme activity of that part of the English Church which is denominated Evangelical, and their industry in bringing over everybody to their habits of thinking and acting; now see what will happen from the following clause: — "And whenever the population of any Benefice shall amount to 2000, and it shall be made appear to the satisfaction of the Bishop, that a stipend can be provided for the payment of a Curate, by voluntary contribution or otherwise, without charge to the Incumbent, it shall be lawful for the Bishop to require the spiritual person holding the same to nominate a fit person to be licensed as such Curate, whatever may be the annual value of such Benefice; and if in either of the said cases, a fit person shall not be nominated to the Bishop within two months after his requisition for that purpose shall have been delivered to the Incumbent, it shall be lawful for the Bishop to appoint and license a Curate." A clause worthy of the Vicar of Wrexhill himself. Now what will happen? The Bishop is a Calvinistic Bishop; wife, children, chaplains, Calvinised up to the teeth. The *serious* people of the parish meet together, and agree to give a hundred pounds per annum, if Mr. Wilkinson is appointed. It requires very little knowledge of human nature to predict, that at the expiration of two months Mr. Wilkinson will be the man; and then the whole parish is torn to pieces with jealousies, quarrels, and comparisons, between the Rector and the delightful Wilkinson. The same scene is acted (*mutatis mutandis*), where the Bishop sets his face against Calvinistic principles. The absurdity consists in suffering the appointment of a Curate by private subscription; in other words, one Clergyman in a parish by *nomination*, the other by *election*; and, in this way, religion is brought into contempt by their

jealousies and quarrels. Little do you know, my dear Lord, of the state of that country you govern, if you suppose this will not happen. I have now a diocese in my eye where I am positively certain, that in less than six months after the passing of this Bill, there will not be a single parish of 2000 persons, in which you will not find a Subscription Curate, of Evangelical habits, canting and crowing over the regular and established Clergyman of the parish.

In the draft of the Fifth Report, upon which I presume your Dean and Chapter Bill is to be founded, I see the rights of patronage are to be conceded to present incumbents. This is very high and honourable conduct in the Commissioners, and such as deserves the warmest thanks of the Clergy; it is always difficult to retract, much more difficult to retract to inferiors; but it is very virtuous to do so when there can be no motive for it but a love of justice.

Your whole Bill is to be one of retrenchment, and amputation; why add fresh Canons to St. Paul's and Lincoln? Nobody wants them; the Cathedrals go on perfectly well without them, they take away each of them 1500*l.* or 1600*l.* per annum, from the fund for the improvement of small Livings; they give, to be sure, a considerable piece of patronage to the Bishops of London and Lincoln, who are Commissioners, and they preserve a childish and pattern-like uniformity in Cathedrals. But the first of these motives is corrupt, and the last silly; and therefore they cannot be your motives.

You cannot plead the recommendation of the Commission for the creation of these new Canons, for you have flung the Commission overboard; and the Reformers of the Church are no longer Archbishops and Bishops, but Lord John Russell;—not those persons to whom the Crown has entrusted the task, but Lord Martin Luther, bred and born in our own island, and nourished by the Woburn spoils and confiscations of the Church. The Church is not without friends, but those friends have said there can be no danger of measures which are sanctioned by the highest Prelates of the Church; but you have chased away the bearers, and taken the Ark into your own possession. Do not forget, however, if you have deviated from the plan of your brother Commissioners, that you have given to them a perfect right to oppose you.

This unfair and wasteful creation of new Canons produces a great and scandalous injustice to St. Paul's and Lincoln, in the distribution of their patronage. The old members of all other Cathedrals will enjoy the benefit of survivorship, till they subside into the magic number of four; up to that point, then, every fresh death will add to the patronage of the remaining old members; but in the Churches of Lincoln and St. Paul's, the old members will immediately have one fifth of their patronage taken away by the creation of a fifth Canon to share it. This injustice and partiality is so monstrous, that the two Prelates in question will see that it is necessary to their own character to apply a remedy. Nothing is more easy than to do so. Let the Bishop's Canon have no share in the distribution of the patronage, till after the death of all those who were Residentiaries at the passing of the Bill.*

Your Dean and Chapter Bill will, I am afraid, cut down the great preferments of the Church too much.

Take for your fund only the Non-Resident Prebends, and leave the number of Resident Prebends as they are, annexing some of them to poor Livings with large populations. I am sure this is all (besides the abolition of Pluralities) which ought to be done, and all that would be done, if the Commissioners were to begin *de novo* from this period, when Bishops have recovered from their fright, Dissenters shrunk into their just dimensions, and the foolish and exaggerated expectations from Reform have vanished away. The great prizes of the Church induce men to carry, and fathers and uncles to send into the Church considerable capitals, and in this way, enable the

* All objected to in this paragraph has been granted.

Clergy to associate with gentlemen, and to command that respect which, in all countries, and above all in this, depends so much on appearances. Your Bill, abolishing Pluralities, and taking away, at the same time, so many dignities, leaves the Church of England so destitute of great prizes, that, as far as mere emolument has any influence, it will be better to dispense cheese and butter in small quantities to the public, than to enter into the Church.

There are admirable men, whose honest and beautiful zeal carries them into the Church without a moment's thought of its emoluments. Such a man combining the manners of a gentleman with the acquirements of a scholar, and the zeal of an Apostle, would overawe mercantile grossness, and extort respect from insolent opulence; but I am talking of average Vicars, mixed natures, and eleven thousand parish Priests. If you divide the great emoluments of the Church into little portions, such as butlers and head gamekeepers receive, you will very soon degrade materially the style and character of the English Clergy. If I were dictator of the Church, as Lord Durham is to be of Canada, I would preserve the Resident, and abolish, for the purposes of a fund, the Non-Resident Prebends. This is the principal and most important alteration in your Dean and Chapter Bill, which it is not too late to make, and for which every temperate and rational man ought to strive.

You will, of course, consider me as a defender of abuses. I have all my life been just the contrary, and I remember, with pleasure, thirty years ago, old Lord Stowell saying to me, "Mr. Smith, you would have been a much richer man if you had joined us." I like, my dear Lord, the road you are travelling, but I don't like the pace you are driving; too similar to that of the son of Nimshi. I always feel myself inclined to cry out, Gently, John, gently down hill. Put on the drag. We shall be over, if you go so quick—you'll do us a mischief.

Remember, as a philosopher, that the Church of England now is a very different Institution from what it was twenty years ago. It then oppressed every sect, they are now all free—all exempt from the tyranny of an Establishment; and the only real cause of complaint for Dissenters is, that they can no longer find a grievance, and enjoy the distinction of being persecuted. I have always tried to reduce them to this state, and I do not pity them.

You have expressed your intention of going beyond the Fifth Report, and limiting Deans to 2000*l.* per annum, Canons to 1000*l.* This is, I presume, in conformity with the treatment of the Bishops, who are limited to from 4500*l.* to 5000*l.* per annum; and it wears a fine appearance of impartial justice: but for the Dean and Canon the sum is a maximum—in Bishops it is a maximum and minimum too; a Bishop cannot have less than 4500*l.*, a Canon may have as little as the poverty of his Church dooms him to, but he cannot have more than 1000*l.*; but there are many Canonries of 500*l.*, or 600*l.*, or 700*l.* per annum, and a few only of 1000*l.*; many Deaneries of from 1000*l.* to 1500*l.* per annum; and only a very few above 2000*l.* If you mean to make the world believe that you are legislating for men without votes, as benevolently as you did for those who have votes in Parliament, you should make up the allowance of every Canon to 1000*l.*, and of every Dean to 2000*l.* per annum, or leave them to the present lottery of blanks and prizes. Besides, too, do I not recollect some remarkable instances, in your Bishops' Act, of deviation from this rigid standard of episcopal wealth? Are not the Archbishops to have the enormous sums of 15,000*l.* and 12,000*l.* per annum? Is not the Bishop of London to have 10,000*l.* per annum? Are not all these three Prelates Commissioners? And is not the reason alleged for the enormous income of the Bishop of London, that everything is so expensive in the metropolis? Do not the Deans of St. Paul's and Westminster, then, live in London also? And can the Bishop of London sit in

his place in the House of Lords, and not urge for those dignitaries the same reasons which were so successful in securing such ample emoluments for his own See? My old friend the Bishop of Durham has 8000*l.* per annum secured to him. I am heartily glad of it; what possible reason can there be for giving him more than other Bishops, and not giving to the Dean of Durham more than other Deans? that is, of leaving to him one half of his present income. It is impossible this can be a claptrap for Joseph Hume, or a set-off against the disasters of Canada; you are too honest and elevated for this. I cannot comprehend what is meant by such gross partiality and injustice.

Why are the economists so eagerly in the field? The public do not contribute one halfpenny to the support of Deans and Chapters; it is not proposed by any one to confiscate the revenues of the Church; the whole is a question of distribution, in what way the revenues of the Church can be best administered for the public good. But whatever may be the respective shares of Peter or Paul, the public will never be richer or poorer by one shilling.

When your Dean and Chapter Bill is printed, I shall take the liberty of addressing you again. The Clergy naturally look with the greatest anxiety to these two Bills; they think that you will avail yourself of this opportunity to punish them for their opposition to your government in the last Elections. They are afraid that your object is not so much to do good as to gratify your vanity, by obtaining the character of a great reformer, and that (now the Bishops are provided for) you will varnish over your political mistakes by increased severity against the Church, or apparently struggling for their good, see with inexpressible delight the Clergy delivered over to the tender mercies of the Radicals. These are the terrors of the Clergy. I judge you with a very different judgment. You are a religious man, not unfriendly to the Church; and but for that most foolish and fatal error of the Church Rates (into which you were led by a man who knows no more of England than of Mesopotamia), I believe you would have gone on well with the Church to the last. There is a genius in action as well as diction; and because you see political evils clearly, and attack them bravely, and cure them wisely, you are a man of real genius, and are most deservedly looked up to as the leader of the Whig party in this Kingdom. I wish, I must confess, you were rather less afraid of Joseph and Daniel; but God has given you a fine understanding, and a fine character; and I have so much confidence in your spirit and honour, that I am sure you would rather abandon your Bills altogether, than suffer the enemies of the Church to convert them into an engine of spoil, and oppression.

I am, &c.

SYDNEY SMITH.

LETTER

ON THE

CHARACTER OF SIR JAMES MACKINTOSH.

My dear Sir,

You ask for some of your late father's letters: I am sorry to say I have none to send you. Upon principle, I keep no letters except those on business. I have not a single letter from him, nor from any human being, in my possession.

The impression which the great talents and amiable qualities of your father made upon me, will remain as long as I remain. When I turn from living spectacles of stupidity, ignorance, and malice, and wish to think better of the world—I remember my great and benevolent friend Mackintosh.

The first points of character which everybody noticed in him were the total absence of envy, hatred, malice, and uncharitableness. He *could* not hate—he did not know how to set about it. The gall-bladder was omitted in his composition, and if he could have been persuaded into any scheme of revenging himself upon an enemy, I am sure (unless he had been narrowly watched) it would have ended in proclaiming the good qualities, and promoting the interests, of his adversary. Truth had so much more power over him than anger, that (whatever might be the provocation) he could not misrepresent nor exaggerate. In questions of passion and party he stated facts as they were, and reasoned fairly upon them, placing his happiness and pride in equitable discrimination. Very fond of talking, he heard patiently; and, not averse to intellectual display, did not forget that others might have the same inclination as himself.

Till subdued by age and illness, his conversation was more brilliant and instructive than that of any human being I ever had the good fortune to be acquainted with. His memory (vast and prodigious as it was) he so managed as to make it a source of pleasure and instruction, rather than that dreadful engine of colloquial oppression into which it is sometimes erected. He remembered things, words, thoughts, dates, and everything that was wanted. His language was beautiful, and might have gone from the fireside to the press; but though his ideas were always clothed in beautiful language, the clothes were sometimes too big for the body, and common thoughts were dressed in better and larger apparel than they deserved. He certainly had this fault, but it was one not of frequent commission.

He had a method of putting things so mildly and interrogatively, that he always procured the readiest reception for his opinions. Addicted to reasoning in the company of able men, he had two valuable habits which are rarely met with in great reasoners—he never broke in upon his opponent, and always avoided strong and vehement assertions. His reasoning commonly carried conviction, for he was cautious in his positions, accurate in his deductions, aimed only at truth. The ingenious side was commonly taken by some one else; the interests of truth were protected by Mackintosh.

His good nature and candour betrayed him into a morbid habit of eulogising everybody—a habit which

destroyed the value of commendations, that might have been to the young (if more sparingly distributed) a reward of virtue and a motive to exertion. Occasionally he took fits of an opposite nature; and I have seen him abating and dissolving pompous gentlemen with the most successful ridicule. He certainly had a good deal of humour; and I remember, amongst many other examples of it, that he kept us for two or three hours in a roar of laughter at a dinner-party at his own house, playing upon the simplicity of a Scotch cousin, who had mistaken me for my gallant synonym, the hero of Acre. I never saw a more perfect comedy, nor heard ridicule so long and so well sustained. Sir James had not only humour, but he had wit also; at least, new and sudden relations of ideas flashed across his mind in reasoning, and produced the same effect as wit, and would have been called wit, if a sense of their utility and importance had not often overpowered the admiration of novelty, and entitled them to the higher name of wisdom. Then the great thoughts and fine sayings of the great men of all ages were intimately present to his recollection, and came out dazzling and delighting in his conversation. Justness of thinking was a strong feature of his understanding; he had a head in which nonsense and error could hardly vegetate: it was a soil utterly unfit for them. If his display in conversation had been only in maintaining splendid paradoxes, he would soon have wearied those he lived with; but no man could live long and intimately with your father without finding that he was gaining upon doubt, correcting error, enlarging the boundaries, and strengthening the foundations of truth. It was worth while to listen to a master, whom not himself but nature had appointed to the office, and who taught what it was not easy to forget, by methods which it was not easy to resist.

Curran, the Master of the Rolls, said to Mr. Grattan, "You would be the greatest man of your age, Grattan, if you would buy a few yards of red tape, and tie up your bills and papers." This was the fault or the misfortune of your excellent father; he never knew the use of red tape, and was utterly unfit for the common business of life. That a guinea represented a quantity of shillings, and that it would barter for a quantity of cloth, he was well aware; but the accurate number of the baser coin, or the just measurement of the manufactured article, to which he was entitled for his gold, he could never learn, and it was impossible to teach him. Hence his life was often an example of the ancient and melancholy struggle of genius with the difficulties of existence.

I have often heard Sir James Mackintosh say of himself that he was born to be the Professor of an University. Happy, and for ages celebrated, would have been the University, which had so possessed him; but in this view he was unjust to himself. Still, however, his style of speaking in parliament was certainly more academic than forensic; it was not sufficiently short and quick for a busy and impatient assembly. He often spoke over the heads of his hearers—was too much in advance of feeling for their sympathies, and of reasoning for their comprehension. He began too much at the beginning, and went too much to the right and left of the question, making rather a lecture or dissertation than a speech. His voice was bad and nasal; and though nobody was in reality more sincere, he seemed not only not to feel, but hardly to think what he was saying.

Your father had very little science, and no great knowledge of physics. His notions of his early pursuit—the study of medicine—were imperfect and antiquated, and he was but an indifferent classical scholar, for the Greek language has never crossed the Tweed in any great force. In history, the whole stream of time was open before him; he had looked into every moral and metaphysical question from Plato to Paley, and had waded through morasses of international law, where the step of no living man could follow him. Political economy is of modern invention. I am old enough to re-

collect when every judge of the bench (Lord Eldon and Serjeant Runnington excepted), in their charges to the grand juries, attributed the then high prices of corn to the scandalous combination of farmers. Sir James knew what is commonly agreed upon by political economists, without taking much pleasure in the science, and with a disposition to blame the very speculative and metaphysical disquisitions into which it has wandered, but with a full conviction also (which many able men of his standing are without) of the immense importance of the science to the welfare of society.

I think (though perhaps some of his friends may not agree with me in this opinion) that he was an acute judge of character, and of the good as well as evil in character. He was, in truth, with the appearance of distraction and of one occupied with other things, a very minute observer of human nature; and I have seen him analyse, to the very springs of the heart, men who had not the most distant suspicion of the sharpness of his vision, nor a belief that he could read anything but books.

Sufficient justice has not been done to his political integrity. He was not rich,—was from the northern part of the island, possessed great facility of temper, and had therefore every excuse for political lubricity, which that vice (more common in those days than I hope it will ever be again) could possibly require. Invited by every party upon his arrival from India, he remained steadfast to his old friends the Whigs, whose admission to office, or enjoyment of political power, would at that period have been considered as the most visionary of all human speculations; yet, during his lifetime, everybody seemed more ready to have forgiven the tergiversation of which he was not guilty, than to admire the actual firmness he had displayed. With all this he never made the slightest efforts to advance his interests with his political friends, never mentioned his sacrifices nor his services, expressed no resentment at neglect, and was therefore pushed into such situations as fall to the lot of the feeble and delicate in a crowd.

A high merit in Sir James Mackintosh was his real and unaffected philanthropy. He did not make the improvement of the great mass of mankind an engine of popularity, and a stepping-stone to power, but he had a genuine love of human happiness. Whatever might assuage the angry passions, and arrange the conflicting interests of nations; whatever could promote peace, increase knowledge, extend commerce, diminish crime, and encourage industry; whatever could exalt human character, and could enlarge human understanding, struck at once at the heart of your father, and roused all his faculties. I have seen him in a moment when this spirit came upon him — like a great ship of war — cut his cable, and spread his enormous canvas, and launch into a wide sea of reasoning eloquence.

But though easily warmed by great schemes of benevolence and human improvement, his manner was cold to individuals. There was an apparent want of heartiness and cordiality. It seemed as if he had more affection for the species than for the ingredients of which it was composed. He was in reality very hospitable, and so fond of company, that he was hardly happy out of it; but he did not receive his friends with that honest joy, which warms more than dinner or wine.

This is the good and evil of your father which comes uppermost. If he had been arrogant and grasping; if he had been faithless and false; if he had been always eager to strangle infant genius in its cradle; always ready to betray and to blacken those with whom he sat at meat; he would have passed many men, who, in the course of his long life, have passed him; — but, without selling his soul for pottage, if he only had had a little more prudence for the promotion of his interests, and more of angry passions for the punishment of those detractors, who envied his fame and presumed upon his sweetness; if he had been more aware of his powers, and of that space which nature intended him to

occupy; he would have acted a great part in life, and remained a character in history. As it is, he has left, in many of the best men in England, and of the Continent, the deepest admiration of his talents, his wisdom, his knowledge, and his benevolence.

I remain, my dear Sir,
Very truly yours,
SYDNEY SMITH.

BALLOT.

IT is possible, and perhaps not very difficult, to invent a machine, by the aid of which electors may vote for a candidate, or for two or three candidates, out of a greater number, without its being discovered for whom they vote; it is less easy than the rabid and foaming Radical supposes; but I have no doubt it may be accomplished. In Mr. Grote's dagger ballot box, which has been carried around the country by eminent patriots, you stab the card of your favourite candidate with a dagger. I have seen another, called the mouse-trap ballot box, in which you poke your finger into the trap of the member you prefer, and are caught and detained till the trap-clerk below (who knows by means of a wire when you are caught) marks your vote, pulls the liberator, and releases you. Which may be the most eligible of these two methods I do not pretend to determine, nor do I think my excellent friend Mr. Babbage has as yet made up his mind on the subject; but, by some means or another, I have no doubt the thing may be done.

Landed proprietors imagine they have a right to the votes of their tenants; and instances, in every election, are numerous where tenants have been dismissed for voting contrary to the wishes of their landlords. In the same manner strong combinations are made against tradesmen who have chosen to think, and act for themselves in political matters, rather than yield their opinions to the solicitations of their customers. There is a great deal of tyranny and injustice in all this. I should no more think of asking what the political opinions of a shopkeeper were, than of asking whether he was tall or short, or large or small: for a difference of 2½ per cent. I would desert the most aristocratic butcher that ever existed, and deal with one who

> "Shook the arsenal, and fulmin'd over Greece."

On the contrary, I would not adhere to the man who put me in uneasy habiliments, however great his veneration for trial by jury, or however ardent his attachment to the liberty of the subject. A tenant I never had; but I firmly believe that if he had gone through certain pecuniary formalities twice a year, I should have thought it a gross act of tyranny to have interfered either with his political or his religious opinions.

I distinctly admit that every man has a right to do what he pleases with his own. I cannot, by law, prevent any one from discharging his tenants, and changing his tradesmen, for political reasons; but I may judge whether that man exercises his right to the public detriment, or for the public advantage. A man has a right to refuse dealing with any tradesman who is not five feet eleven inches high; but if he act upon this rule, he is either a madman or a fool. He has a right to lay waste his own estate, and to make it utterly barren; but I have

also a right to point him out as one who exercises his right in a manner very injurious to society. He may set up a religious or a political test for his tradesmen; but admitting his right, and deprecating all interference with law, I must tell him he is making the aristocracy odious to the great mass, and that he is sowing the seeds of revolution. His purse may be full, and his fields may be wide; but the moralist will still hold the rod of public opinion over his head, and tell the money-bloated blockhead that he is shaking those laws of property which it has taken ages to extort from the wretchedness and rapacity of mankind; and that what he calls his own will not long be his own, if he tramples too heavily on human patience.

All these practices are bad; but the facts and the consequences are exaggerated.

In the first place, the plough is not a political machine: the loom and the steam-engine are furiously political, but the plough is not. Nineteen tenants out of twenty care nothing about their votes, and pull off their opinions as easily to their landlords as they do their hats. As far as the great majority of tenants are concerned, these histories of persecution are mere declamatory nonsense; they have no more predilection for whom they vote than the organ pipes have for what tunes they are to play. A tenant dismissed for a fair and just cause often attributes his dismissal to political motives, and endeavours to make himself a martyr with the public: a man who ploughs badly, or who pays badly, says he is dismissed for his vote. No candidate is willing to allow that he has lost his election by his demerits; and he seizes hold of these stories, and circulates them with the greatest avidity: they are stated in the House of Commons; John Russell and Spring Rice fall a crying: there is lamentation of Liberals in the land; and many groans for the territorial tyrants.

A standing reason against the frequency of dismissal of tenants is that it is always injurious to the pecuniary interests of the landlord to dismiss a tenant: the property always suffers in some degree by a going-off tenant; and it is therefore always the interest of a landlord not to change when the tenant does his duty as an agriculturalist.

To part with tenants for political reasons always makes a landlord unpopular. The Constitutional, price 4*d.*; the Cato, at 3½*d.*; and the Lucius Junius Brutus, at 2*d.*, all set upon the unhappy scutiger; and the squire, unused to be pointed at, and thinking that all Europe and part of Asia are thinking of him and his farmers, is driven to the brink of suicide and despair. That such things are done is not denied, that they are scandalous when they are done is equally true; but these are reasons why such acts are less frequent than they are commonly represented to be. In the same manner, there are instances of shopkeepers being materially injured in their business from the votes they have given; but the facts themselves, as well as the consequences, are grossly exaggerated. If shopkeepers lose Tory they gain Whig customers; and it is not always the vote which does the mischief, but the low vulgar impertinence, and the unbridled scurrility of a man, who thinks that by dividing to mankind their rations of butter and of cheese he has qualified himself for legislation, and that he can hold the rod of empire because he has wielded the yard of mensuration. I detest all inquisition into political opinions, but I have very rarely seen a combination against any tradesman who modestly, quietly, and conscientiously took his own line in politics. But Brutus and butterman, cheesemonger and Cato, do not harmonise well together; good taste is offended, the coxcomb loses his friends, and general disgust is mistaken for combined oppression. Shopkeepers, too, are very apt to cry out before they are hurt: a man who sees after an election one of his customers buying a pair of gloves on the opposite side of the way roars out that his honesty will make him a bankrupt,

and the county papers are filled with letters from Brutus, Publicola, Hampden, and Pym.

This interference with the freedom of voting, bad as it is, produces no political deliberation; it does not make the Tories stronger than the Whigs, nor the Whigs than the Tories, for both are equally guilty of this species of tyranny; and any particular system of measures fails or prevails, much as if no such practice existed. The practice had better not be at all; but if a certain quantity of the evil does exist, it is better that it should be equally divided among both parties, than that it should be exercised by one, for the depression of the other. There are politicians always at a white heat, who suppose that there are landed tyrants only on one side of the question; but human life has been distressingly abridged by the flood: there is no time to spare, — it is impossible to waste it upon such senseless bigotry.

If a man be sheltered from intimidation, is it at all clear that he would vote from any better motive than intimidation? If you make so tremendous an experiment, are you sure of attaining your object? The landlord has perhaps said a cross word to the tenant; the candidate for whom the tenant votes in opposition to his landlord has taken his second son for a footman, or his father knew the candidate's grandfather: how many thousand votes, sheltered (as the ballotists suppose) from intimidation, would be given from such silly motives as these? how many would be given from the mere discontent of inferiority? or from that strange simious schoolboy passion of giving pain to others, even when the author cannot be found out? — motives as pernicious as any which could proceed from intimidation. So that all voters screened by ballot would not be screened for any public good.

The Radicals, (I do not use this word in any offensive sense, for I know many honest and excellent men of this way of thinking,) — but the Radicals praise and admit the lawful influence of wealth and power. They are quite satisfied if a rich man of popular manners gains the votes and affections of his dependants; but why is not this as bad as intimidation? The real object is to vote for the good politician, not for the kind-hearted or agreeable man: the mischief is just the same to the country whether I am smiled into a corrupt choice, or frowned into a corrupt choice, — what is it to me whether my landlord is the best of landlords, or the most agreeable of men? I must vote for Joseph Hume, if I think Joseph more honest than the Marquis. The more mitigated Radical may pass over this, but the real carnivorous variety of the animal should declaim as loudly against the fascinations as against the threats of the great. The man who possesses the land should never speak to the man who tills it. The intercourse between landlord and tenant should be as strictly guarded as that of the sexes in Turkey. A funded duenna should be placed over every landed grandee. — And then intimidation! Is intimidation confined to the aristocracy? Can anything be more scandalous and atrocious than the intimidation of mobs? Did not the mob of Bristol occasion more ruin, wretchedness, death, and alarm than all the ejection of tenants, and combinations against shopkeepers, from the beginning of the century? and did not the Scotch philosophers tear off the clothes of the Tories in Mintoshire? or at least such clothes as the customs of the country admit of being worn? — and did not they, without any reflection at all upon the customs of the country, wash the Tory voters in the river?

Some sanguine advocates of the ballot contend that it would put an end to all canvassing: why should it do so? Under the ballot, I canvass (it is true) a person who may secretly deceive me. I cannot be sure he will not do so — but I am sure it is much less likely he will vote against me, when I have paid him all the deference and attention which a representative bestows on his constituents, than

if I had totally neglected him: to any other objections he may have against me, at least I will not add that of personal incivility.

Scarcely is any great virtue practised without some sacrifice; and the admiration which virtue excites seems to proceed from the contemplation of such sufferings, and of the exertions by which they are endured: a tradesman suffers some loss of trade by voting for his country; is he not to vote? he might suffer some loss of blood in fighting for his country; is he not to fight? Every one would be a good Samaritan, if he were quite sure his compassion would cost him nothing. We should all be heroes, if it were not for blood and fractures; all saints, if it were not for the restrictions and privations of sanctity; all patriots, if it were not for the losses and misrepresentations to which patriotism exposes us. The ballotists are a set of Englishmen glowing with the love of England and the love of virtue, but determined to hazard the most dangerous experiments in politics, rather than run the risk of losing a penny in defence of their exalted feelings.

An abominable tyranny exercised by the ballot is, that it compels those persons to conceal their votes, who hate all concealment, and who glory in the cause they support. If you are afraid to go in at the front door, and to say in a clear voice what you have to say, go in at the back door, and say it in a whisper—but this is not enough for you; you make me, who am bold and honest, sneak in at the back door as well as yourself: because you are afraid of selling a dozen or two of gloves less than usual, you compel me, who have no gloves to sell, or who would dare and despise the loss if I had, to hide the best feelings of my heart, and to lower myself down to your mean morals. It is as if a few cowards, who could only fight behind walls and houses, were to prevent the whole regiment from showing a bold front in the field: what right has the coward to degrade me who am no coward, and put me in the same shameful predicament with himself? If ballot be established, a zealous voter cannot do justice to his cause; there will be so many false Hampdens, and spurious Catos, that all men's actions and motives will be mistrusted. It is in the power of any man to tell me that my colours are false, that I declaim with simulated warmth, and canvass with fallacious zeal; that I am a Tory, though I call *Russell* for ever, or a Whig, in spite of my obstreperous panegyrics of *Peel*. It is really a curious condition that all men must imitate the defects of a few, in order that it may not be known who have the natural imperfection, and who put it on from conformity. In this way in former days, to hide the grey hairs of the old, everybody was forced to wear powder and pomatum.

It must not be forgotten that, in the ballot, concealment must be absolutely *compulsory*. It would never do to let one man vote openly, and another secretly. You may go to the edge of the box and say, "I vote for A.," but who knows that your ball is not put in for B.? There must be a clear plain opportunity for telling an undiscoverable lie, or the whole invention is at an end. How beautiful is the progress of man!—printing has abolished ignorance—gas put an end to darkness—steam has conquered time and distance—it remained for Grote and his box to remove the encumbrance of truth from human transactions. May we not look now for more little machines to abolish the other cardinal virtues?

But if all men are suspected; if things are so contrived that it is impossible to know what men really think, a serious impediment is created to the formation of good public opinion in the multitude. There is a town (No. 1.) in which live two very clever and respectable men, Johnson and Pelham, small tradesmen, men always willing to run some risk for the public good, and to be less rich, and more honest than their neighbours. It is of considerable consequence to the formation of opinion in this town, as an example, to know how Johnson and Pelham vote. It guides the affections,

and directs the understandings, of the whole population, and materially affects public opinion in this town; and in another borough (No. 2.), it would be of the highest importance to public opinion if it were certain how Mr. Smith, the ironmonger, and Mr. Rogers, the London carrier, voted; because they are both thoroughly honest men, and of excellent understanding for their condition of life. Now, the tendency of ballot would be to destroy all the Pelhams, Johnsons, Rogers's, and Smiths, to sow a universal mistrust, and to exterminate the natural guides and leaders of the people: political influence, founded upon honour and ancient honesty in politics, could not grow up under such a system. No man's declaration could get believed. It would be easy to whisper away the character of the best men; and to assert that, in spite of all his declarations, which are nothing but a blind, the romantic Rogers has voted on the other side, and is in secret league with our enemies.

"Who brought that mischievous profligate villain into Parliament? Let us see the names of his real supporters. Who stood out against the strong and uplifted arm of power? Who discovered this excellent and hitherto unknown person? Who opposed the man whom we all know to be one of the first men in the country?" Are these fair and useful questions to be veiled hereafter in impenetrable mystery? Is this sort of publicity of no good as a restraint? is it of no good as an incitement to and a reward for exertions? Is not public opinion formed by such feelings? and is it not a dark and demoralising system to draw this veil over human actions, to say to the mass, be base, and you will not be despised; be virtuous, and you will not be honoured? Is this the way in which Mr. Grote would foster the spirit of a bold and indomitable people? Was the liberty of that people established by fraud? Did America lie herself into independence? Was it treachery which enabled Holland to shake off the yoke of Spain? Is there any instance since the beginning of the world where human liberty has been established by little systems of trumpery and trick? These are the weapons of monarchs against the people, not of the people against monarchs. With their own right hand, and with their mighty arm, have the people gotten to themselves the victory, and upon them may they ever depend; and then comes Mr. Grote, a scholar and a gentleman, and knowing all the histories of public courage, preaches cowardice and treachery to England; tells us that the bold cannot be free, and bids us seek for liberty by clothing ourselves in the mask of falsehood, and trampling on the cross of truth.*

If this shrinking from the performance of duties is to be tolerated, voters are not the only persons who would recur to the accommodating convenience of ballot. A member of Parliament who votes against Government can get nothing in the army, navy, or Church, or at the bar, for his children or himself: they are placed on the north wall, and starved for their honesty. Judges, too, suffer for their unpopularity—Lord Kilwarden was murdered, Lord Mansfield burnt down! but voters, forgetting that they are only trustees for those who have no vote, require that they themselves should be virtuous with impunity, and that all the penalties of austerity and Catonism should fall upon others. I am aware that it is of the greatest consequence to the constituent that he should be made acquainted with the conduct of his representative; but I maintain, that to know, without the fear of mistake, what the conduct of individuals has been in their fulfilment of the great trust of electing members of Parliament, is also of the greatest importance in the formation of public opinion; and that, when men acted in the dark, the power of distinguishing between the bad and good would be at an end.

To institute ballot is to apply a very dangerous innovation to a temporary evil; for it is seldom, but in very excited times, that these acts of power

* Mr. Grote is a very worthy, honest, and able man; and if the world were a chessboard, would be an important politician.

are complained of which the ballot is intended to remedy. There never was an instance in this country where parties were so nearly balanced; but all this will pass away, and, in a very few years, either Peel will swallow Lord John, or Lord John will pasture upon Peel; parties will coalesce, the Duke of Wellington and Viscount Melbourne meet at the same board, and the lion lie down with the lamb. In the meantime a serious and dangerous political change is resorted to for the cure of a temporary evil, and we may be cursed with ballot when we do not want it, and cannot get rid of it.

If there be ballot there can be no scrutiny, the controlling power of Parliament is lost, and the members are entirely in the hands of returning officers.

An election is hard run—the returning officer lets in twenty votes which he ought to have excluded, and the opposite candidate is unjustly returned. I petition, and as the law now stands, the return would be amended, and I, who had the legitimate majority, should be seated in Parliament. But how could justice be done if the ballot obtained, and if the returning officer were careless or corrupt? Would you put all the electors upon their oath? Would it be advisable to accept any oath where detection was impossible? and could any approximation to truth be expected under such circumstances, from such an inquisition? It is true, the present committees of the House of Commons are a very unfair tribunal, but that tribunal may and will be amended; and bad as that tribunal is, nobody can be insane enough to propose that we are to take refuge in the blunders or the corruptions of 600 returning officers, 100 of whom are Irish.

It is certainly in the power of a committee, when incapacity or villany of the returning officer has produced an unfair return, to annul the whole election and to proceed again *de novo*; but how is this just? or what satisfaction is this to me, who have unquestionably a lawful majority, and who ask of the House of Commons to examine the votes, and to place in their house the man who has combined the greatest number of suffrages? The answer of the House of Commons is, "One of you is undoubtedly the rightful member, but we have so framed our laws of election, that it is impossible to find out which that man is; the loss and penalties ought only to fall upon one, but they must fall upon both; we put the well-doer and the evil-doer precisely in the same situation, there shall be no election;" and this may happen ten times running.

Purity of election, the fair choice of representatives, must be guarded either by the coercing power of the House of Commons exercised upon petitions, or it must be guarded by the watchful jealousy of opposite parties at the registrations; but if (as the Radicals suppose) ballot gives a power of perfect concealment, whose interest is it to watch the registrations? If I despair of distinguishing my friends from my foes, why should I take any trouble about registrations? Why not leave everything to that great *primum mobile* of all human affairs, the barrister of six years' standing?

The answer of the excellent Benthamites to all this is, "What you say may be true enough in the present state of registrations, but we have another scheme of registration to which these objections will not apply." There is really no answering this Paulopost legislation. I reason now upon registration and reform which are in existence, which I have seen at work for several years. What new improvements are in the womb of time, or (if time have no womb) in the more capacious pockets of the followers of Bentham, I know not: when I see them tried I will reason upon them. There is no end to these eternal changes; we have made an enormous revolution within the last ten years,—let us stop a little and secure it, and prevent it from being turned into ruin; I do not say the Reform Bill is final, but I want a little time for breathing; and if there are to be any more changes, let them be carried into execution hereafter

by those little legislators who are now receiving every day after dinner a cake or a plum, in happy ignorance of Mr. Grote and his ballot. I long for the quiet times of *Log*, when all the English common people are making calico, and all the English gentlemen are making long and short verses, with no other interruption of their happiness than when false quantities are discovered in one or the other.

What is to become of petitions if ballot is established? Are they to be open as they now are, or are they to be conducted by ballot? Are the radical shopkeepers and the radical tenant to be exposed (as they say) to all the fury of incensed wealth and power, and is that protection to be denied to them in petitions, which is so loudly demanded in the choice of representatives? Are there to be two distinct methods of ascertaining the opinions of the people, and these completely opposed to each other? A member is chosen this week by a large majority of voters who vote in the dark, and the next week, when men vote in the light of day, some petition is carried totally opposite to all those principles for which the member with invisible votes was returned to Parliament. How, under such a system, can Parliament ever ascertain what the wishes of the people really are? The representatives are Radicals, the petitioners eminently conservative; the voice is the voice of Jacob, but the hands are the hands of Esau.

And if the same protection be adopted for petitions as is given in elections, and if both are conducted by ballot, how are the House of Commons to deal with petitions? When it is intended particularly that a petition should attract the attention of the House of Commons, some member bears witness to the respectability or the futility of the signatures; and how is it possible, without some guides of this kind, that the House could form any idea of the value and importance of the petition?

These observations apply with equal force to the communications between the representative and the constituent. It is the Radical doctrine that a representative is to obey the instructions of his constituents. He has been elected under the ballot by a large majority; an open meeting is called, and he receives instructions in direct opposition to all those principles upon which he has been elected. Is this the real opinion of his constituents? and if he receive his instructions for a ballot meeting, who are his instructors? The lowest men in the town, or the wisest and the best?—But if ballot be established for elections only, and all communications between the constituents on one side, and Parliament and the representatives on the other, are carried on in open meetings, then are there two publics according to the Radical doctrines, essentially differing from each other; the one acting under the influence of the rich and powerful, the other free; and if all political petitions are to be carried on by ballot, how are Parliament to know who petitions, or the member to know who instructs?

I have hitherto spoken of ballot, as if it were, as the Radicals suppose it to be, a mean of secrecy; their very cardinal position is, that landlords, after the ballot is established, will give up in despair all hopes of commanding the votes of their tenants. I scarcely ever heard a more foolish and gratuitous assumption. Given up? Why should they be given up? I can give many reasons why landlords should never exercise this unreasonable power, but I can give no possible reason why a man determined to do so should be baffled by the ballot. When two great parties in the empire are combating for the supreme power, does Mr. Grote imagine, that the man of woods, forests, and rivers,—that they who have the strength of the hills,—are to be baffled by bumpkins thrusting a little pin into a little card in a little box? that England is to be governed by political acupunctuation?

A landlord who would otherwise be guilty of the oppression will not change his purpose, because you attempt to outwit him by the invention of the ballot; he will become, on the con-

trary, doubly vigilant, inquisitive, and severe. "I am a professed Radical," said the tenant of a great duke to a friend of mine, "and the duke knows it; but if I vote for his candidates, he lets me talk as I please, live with whom I please, and does not care if I dine at a Radical dinner every day in the week. If there was a ballot, nothing could persuade the duke, or the duke's master, the steward, that I was not deceiving them, and I should lose my farm in a week." This is the real history of what would take place. The single lie on the hustings would not suffice; the concealed democrat who voted against his landlord must talk with the wrong people, subscribe to the wrong club, huzza at the wrong dinner, break the wrong head, lead (if he wished to escape from the watchful jealousy of his landlord) a long life of lies between every election; and he must do this, not only *eundo*, in his calm and prudential state, but *redeundo* from the market, warmed with beer, and expanded by alcohol; and he must not only carry on his seven years of dissimulation before the world, but in the very bosom of his family, or he must expose himself to the dangerous garrulity of wife, children, and servants, from whose indiscretion every kind of evil report would be carried to the ears of the watchful steward. And when once the ballot is established, mere gentle, quiet lying will not do to hide the tenant who secretly votes against his landlord: the quiet passive liar will be suspected, and he will find, if he does not wave his bonnet and strain his throat in furtherance of his bad faith, and lie loudly, that he has put in a false ball in the dark to very little purpose. I consider a long concealment of political opinion from the landlord to be nearly impossible for the tenant: and if you conceal from the landlord the only proof he can have of his tenant's sincerity, you are taking from the tenant the only means he has of living quietly upon his farm. You are increasing the jealousy and irascibility of the tyrant, and multiplying instead of lessening the number of his victims.

Not only you do not protect the tenant who wishes to deceive his landlord, by promising one way and voting another, but you expose all the other tenants who have no intention of deceiving, to all the evils of mistake and misrepresentation. The steward hates a tenant, and a rival wants his farm; they begin to whisper him out of favour, and to propagate rumours of his disaffection to the blue or the yellow cause; as matters now stand he can refer to the poll-book and show how he has voted. Under the ballot his security is gone, and he is exposed in common with his deceitful neighbour, to that suspicion from which none can be exempt when all vote in secret. If ballot then answered the purpose for which it was intended, the number of honest tenants whom it exposed to danger would be as great as the number of deceitful tenants whom it screened.

But if landlords could be prevented from influencing their tenants in voting, by threatening them with the loss of farms;—if public opinion were too strong to allow of such threats, what would prevent a landlord from refusing to take, as a tenant, a man whose political opinion did not agree with his own? what would prevent him from questioning, long before the election, and cross-examining his tenant, and demanding certificates of his behaviour and opinions, till he had, according to all human probability, found a man who felt as strongly as himself upon political subjects, and who would adhere to those opinions with as much firmness and tenacity? What would prevent, for instance, an Orange landlord from filling his farms with Orange tenants, and from cautiously rejecting every Catholic tenant who presented himself plough in hand? But if this practice were to obtain generally, of cautiously selecting tenants from their political opinion, what would become of the sevenfold shield of the ballot? Not only this tenant is not continued in the farm he already holds, but he finds, from the severe inquisition into which men of property are driven by the invention of ballot,

that it is extremely difficult for a man whose principles are opposed to those of his landlord, to get any farm at all.

The noise and jollity of a ballot mob must be such as the very devils would look on with delight. A set of deceitful wretches wearing the wrong colours, abusing their friends, pelting the man for whom they voted, drinking their enemies' punch, knocking down persons with whom they entirely agreed, and roaring out eternal duration to principles they abhorred. A scene of wholesale bacchanalian fraud, a *posse comitatus* of liars, which would disgust any man with a free government, and make him sigh for the monocracy of Constantinople.

All the arguments which apply to suspected tenants apply to suspected shopkeepers. Their condition under the ballot would be infinitely worse than under the present system; the veracious shopkeeper would be suspected, perhaps without having his vote to appeal to for his protection, and the shopkeeper who meant to deceive must prop up his fraud, by accommodating his whole life to the first deceit, or he would have told a disgraceful falsehood in vain. The political persecutors would not be baffled by the ballot: customers who think they have a right to persecute tradesmen now, would do it then; the only difference would be that more would be persecuted then on suspicion, than are prosecuted now from a full knowledge of every man's vote. Inquisitors would be exasperated by this attempt of their victims to become invisible, and the search for delinquents would be more sharp and incessant.

A state of things may (to be sure) occur where the aristocratic part of the voters may be desirous, by concealing their votes, of protecting themselves from the fury of the multitude; but precisely the same objection obtains against ballot, whoever may be the oppressor or the oppressed. It is no defence; the single falsehood at the hustings will not suffice. Hypocrisy for seven years is impossible; the multitude will be just as jealous of preserving the power of intimidation, as aristocrats are of preserving the power of property, and will in the same way redouble their vicious activity from the attempt at destroying their empire by ballot.

Ballot could not prevent the disfranchisement of a great number of voters. The shopkeeper, harassed by men of both parties, equally consuming the articles in which he dealt, would seek security in not voting at all, and, of course, the ballot could not screen the disobedient tenant whom the landlord requested to stay away from the poll. Mr. Grote has no box for this; but a remedy for securing the freedom of election, which has no power to prevent the voter from losing the exercise of his franchise altogether, can scarcely be considered as a remedy at all. There is a method, indeed, by which this might be remedied, if the great soul of Mr. Grote will stoop to adopt it. Why are the acts of concealment to be confined to putting in a ball? Why not vote in a domino, taking off the vizor to the returning officer only? or as tenant Jenkins or tenant Hodge might be detected by their stature, why not poll in sedan chairs with the curtains closely drawn, choosing the chairman by ballot?

What a flood of deceit and villany comes in with ballot! I admit there are great moral faults under the present system. It is a serious violation of duty to vote for A. when you think B. the more worthy representative; but the open voter, acting under the influence of his landlord, commits only this one fault, great as it is:—if he vote for his candidate, the landlord is satisfied, and asks no other sacrifice of truth and opinion; but if the tenant vote against his landlord under the ballot, he is practising every day some fraud to conceal his first deviation from truth. The present method may produce a vicious act, but the ballot establishes a vicious habit; and then it is of some consequence, that the law should not range itself on the side of vice. In the open voting, the law leaves you fairly to choose between the dangers of giving an honest, or the convenience of giving a dishonest vote;

but the ballot law opens a booth and asylum for fraud, calling upon all men to lie by beat of drum, forbidding open honesty, promising impunity for the most scandalous deceit, and encouraging men to take no other view of virtue than whether it pays or does not pay; for it must always be remembered and often repeated, and said and sung to Mr. Grote, that it is to the degraded liar only that the box will be useful. The man who performs what he promises needs no box. The man who refuses to do what he is asked to do despises the box. The liar, who says he will do what he never means to do, is the only man to whom the box is useful, and for whom this leaf out of the punic Pandects is to be inserted in our statute book; the other vices will begin to look up, and to think themselves neglected, if falsehood obtains such flattering distinction, and is thus defended by the solemn enactments of law.

Old John Randolph, the American orator, was asked one day at a dinner party in London, whether the ballot prevailed in his state of Virginia—"I scarcely believe," he said, "we have such a fool in all Virginia, as to mention even the vote by ballot; and I do not hesitate to say that the adoption of the ballot *would make any nation a nation of scoundrels if it did not find them so.*" John Randolph was right; he felt that it was not necessary that a people should be false in order to be free; uinversal hypocrisy would be the consequence of ballot: we should soon say on deliberation what David only asserted in his haste, *that all men were liars.*

This exclamation of old Randolph applied to the method of popular elections, which I believe has always been by open voice in Virginia; but the assemblies voted, and the Judges were chosen by ballot; and in the year 1830, upon a solemn review of their institutions, ballot was entirely abolished in every instance throughout the State, and open voting substituted in its place.

Not only would the tenant under ballot be constantly exposed to the suspicions of the landlord, but the landlord would be exposed to the constant suspicions and the unjust misrepresentation of the tenant. Every tenant who was dismissed for a fair and a just cause, would presume he was suspected, would attribute his dismissal to political motives, and endeavour to make himself a martyr with the public; and in this way violent hatred would be by the ballot disseminated among classes of men on whose agreement the order and happiness of England depends.

All objections to ballot which are important in England, apply with much greater force to Ireland, a country of intense agitation, fierce passions, and quick movements. Then how would the ballot box of Mr. Grote harmonise with the confessional box of Father O'Leary?

I observe Lord John Russell, and some important men as well as him, saying, "We hate ballot, but if these practices continue, we shall be compelled to vote for it." What! vote for it, if ballot be no remedy for these evils? Vote for it, if ballot produce still greater evils than it cures? That is (says the physician), if fevers increase in this alarming manner, I shall be compelled to make use of some medicine which will be of no use to fevers, and will at the same time bring on diseases of a much more serious nature. I shall be under the absolute necessity of putting out your eyes, because I cannot prevent you from being lame. In fact, this sort of language is utterly unworthy of the sense and courage of Lord John; he gives hopes where he *ought* to create absolute despair. This is that hovering between two principles which ruins political strength by lowering political character, and creates a notion that his enemies need not fear such a man, and that his friends cannot trust him. No opinion could be more unjust as applied to Lord John; but such an opinion will grow if he begin to value himself more upon his dexterity and finesse, than upon those fine manly historico-Russell qualities he most undoubtedly possesses. There are two beautiful words in the English language,—Yes and No; he must pronounce them boldly and emphatically;

stick to Yes and No to the death; for Yes and No lay his head down upon the scaffold, where his ancestors have laid their heads before, and cling to his Yes and No in spite of Robert Peel and John Wilson, and Joseph, and Daniel, and Fergus, and Stephens himself. He must do as the Russells always have done, advance his firm foot on the field of honour, plant it on the line marked out by justice, and determine in that cause to perish or to prevail.

In clubs, ballot preserves secrecy; but in clubs, after the barrister has blackballed the colonel, he most likely never hears of the colonel again: he does not live among people who are calling out for seven years *the colonel for ever;* nor is there any one who, thinking he has a right to the barrister's suffrage, exercises the most incessant vigilance to detect whether or not he has been defrauded of it. I do not say that ballot can never in any instance be made a mean of secrecy and safety, but that it cannot be so in popular elections. Even in elections, a consummate hypocrite who was unmarried, and drank water, might perhaps exercise his timid patriotism with impunity; but the instances would be so rare, as to render ballot utterly inefficient as a general protection against the abuses of power.

In America, ballot is nearly a dead letter; no protection is wanted: if the ballot protects any one it is the master, not the man. Some of the States have no ballot—some have exchanged the ballot for open voting.

Bribery carried on in any town now, would probably be carried on with equal success under the ballot. The attorney (if such a system prevailed) would say to the candidate, "There is my list of promises: if you come in I will have 5000*l.*, and if you do not, you shall pay me nothing." To this list, to which I suppose all the venal rabble of the town to have put their names, there either is an opposition bribery list, or there is not: if there is not, the promisers, looking only to make money by their vote, have every inducement to keep their word. If there be an opposite list, the only trick which a promiser can play is to put down his name upon both lists: but this trick would be so easily detected, so much watched and suspected, and would even in the vote market render a man so infamous, that it never would be attempted to any great extent. At present, if a man promise his vote to A., and votes for B., because he can get more money by it, he does not become infamous among the bribed, because they lose no money by him; but where a list is found, and a certain sum of money is to be divided among that list, every interloper lessens the receipts of all the rest; it becomes their interest to guard against fraudulent intrusion; and a man who puts his name upon more lists than the votes he was entitled to give, would soon be hunted down by those he had robbed. Of course there would be no pay till after the election, and the man who having one vote had put himself down on two lists, or having two votes had put himself down on three lists, could hardly fail to be detected, and would, of course, lose his political *aceldama.* There must be honour among thieves; the mob regularly inured to bribery under the canopy of the ballot, would for their own sake soon introduce rules for the distribution of the plunder, and infuse with their customary energy, the morality of not being sold more than once at every election.

If ballot were established, it would be received by the upper classes with the greatest possible suspicion, and every effort would be made to counteract it and to get rid of it. Against those attacks the inferior orders would naturally wish to strengthen themselves, and the obvious means would be by extending the number of voters; and so comes on universal suffrage. The ballot would fail: it would be found neither to prevent intimidation nor bribery. Universal suffrage would cure both, as a teaspoonful of prussic acid is a certain cure for the most formidable diseases; but universal suffrage would in all probability be the next step. "The 200 richest voters

of Bridport shall not beat the 400 poorest voters. Everybody who has a house shall vote, or everybody who is twenty-one shall vote, and then the people will be sure to have their way — we will blackball every member standing for Bridgewater who does not promise to vote for universal suffrage."

The ballot and universal suffrage are never mentioned by the Radicals without being coupled together. Nobody ever thinks of separating them. Any person who attempted to separate them at torchlight or sunlight meetings would be hooted down. It is professedly avowed that ballot is only wanted for ulterior purposes, and no one makes a secret of what those ulterior purposes are: not only would the gift of ballot, if universal suffrage were refused, not be received with gratitude, but it would be received with furious indignation and contempt, and universal suffrage be speedily extorted from you.

There would be this argument also for universal suffrage, to which I do not think it very easy to find an answer. The son of a man who rents a house of ten pounds a year is often a much cleverer man than his father; the wife more intelligent than the husband. Under the system of open voting, these persons are not excluded from want of intellect, but for want of independence, for they would necessarily vote with their principal; but the moment the ballot is established, according to the reasoning of the Grote school, one man is as independent as another, because all are concealed, and so all are equally entitled to offer their suffrages. This cannot sow dissensions in families; for how, ballotically reasoning, can the father find it out? or, if he did find it out, how has any father, ballotically speaking, a right to control the votes of his family?

I have often drawn a picture in my own mind of a Balloto-Grotical family voting and promising under the new system. There is one vacancy, and three candidates, Tory, Whig, and Radical. Walter Wiggins, a small artificer of shoes, for the moderate gratuity of five pounds, promises his own vote, and that of the chaste Arabella his wife, to the Tory candidate; he, Walter Wiggins, having also sold, for one sovereign, the vote of the before-named Arabella to the Whigs. Mr. John Wiggins, a tailor, the male progeny of Walter and Arabella, at the solicitation of his master, promises his vote to the Whigs, and persuades his sister Honoria to make a similar promise in the same cause. Arabella, the wife, yields implicitly to the wishes of her husband. In this way, before the election, stand committed the highly moral family of Mr. Wiggins. The period for lying arrives, and the mendacity machine is exhibited to the view of the Wigginses. What happens? Arabella, who has in the interim been chastised by her drunken husband, votes secretly for the Radicals, having been sold both to Whig and Tory. Mr. John Wiggins, pledged beyond redemption to Whigs, votes for the Tory; and Honoria, extrinsically furious in the cause of Whigs, is persuaded by her lover to vote for the Radical member. The following Table exhibits the state of this moral family, before and after the election:

Walter Wiggins sells himself once and his wife twice.
Arabella Wiggins, sold to Tory and Whig, votes for Radical.
John Wiggins, promised to Whig, votes for Tory.
Honoria Wiggins, promised to Whig, votes for Radical.

In this way the families of the poor, under the legislation of Mr. Grote, will become schools for good faith, openness, and truth! What are Chrysippus and Crantor, and all the moralists of the whole world, compared to Mr. Grote?

It is urged that the lower order of voters, proud of such a distinction, will not be anxious to extend it to others: but the lower order of voters will often find that they possess this distinction in vain — that wealth and education are too strong for them; and they will call in the multitude as auxiliaries, firmly believing that they can curb their inferiors and conquer

their superiors. Ballot is a mere illusion, but universal suffrage is not an illusion. The common people will get nothing by the one, but they will gain everything, and *ruin* everything, by the last.

Some members of Parliament who mean to vote for ballot, in the fear of losing their seats, and who are desirous of reconciling to their conscience such an act of disloyalty to mankind, are fond of saying that ballot is harmless; that it will neither do the good nor the evil that is expected from it; and that the people may fairly be indulged in such an innocent piece of legislation. Never was such folly and madness as this: ballot will be the cause of interminable hatred and jealousy among the different orders of mankind; it will familiarise the English people to a long tenor of deceit; it will not answer its purpose of protecting the independent voter, and the people, exasperated and disappointed by the failure, will indemnify themselves by insisting upon unlimited suffrage. And then it is talked of as an experiment, as if men were talking of acids and alkalies, and the galvanic pile; as if Lord John could get on the hustings and say, "Gentlemen, you see this ballot does not answer; do me the favour to give it up, and to allow yourselves to be replaced in the same situation as the ballot found you." Such, no doubt, is the history of nations and the march of human affairs; and, in this way, the error of a sudden and foolish largess of power to the people might, no doubt, be easily retrieved! The most unpleasant of all bodily feelings is a cold sweat: nothing brings it on so surely as perilous nonsense in politics. I lose all warmth from the bodily frame when I hear the ballot talked of as an *experiment.*

I cannot at all understand what is meant by this indolent opinion. Votes are coerced now; if votes are free, will the elected be the same? if not, will the difference of the elected be unimportant? Will not the ballot stimulate the upper orders to fresh exertions? and is their increased jealousy and interference of no importance? If ballot, after all, be found to hold out a real protection to the voter, is universal lying of no importance? I can understand what is meant by calling ballot a great good, or a great evil; but, in the mighty contention for power which is raging in this country, to call it indifferent, appears to me extremely foolish in all those in whom it is not extremely dishonest.

If the ballot did succeed in enabling the lower order of voters to conquer their betters, so much the worse. In a town consisting of 700 voters, the 300 most opulent and powerful (and therefore probably the best instructed) would make a much better choice than the remaining 400; and the ballot would, in that case, do more harm than good. In nineteen cases out of twenty, the most numerous party would be in the wrong. If this be the case, why give the franchise to all? why not confine it to the first division? *because even with all the abuses which occur, and in spite of them, the great mass of the people are much more satisfied with having a vote occasionally controlled, than with having none.* Many agree with their superiors, and therefore feel no control. Many are persuaded by their superiors, and not controlled. Some are indifferent which way they exercise the power, though they would not like to be utterly deprived of it. Some guzzle away their vote, some sell it, some brave their superiors, if they are threatened and controlled. The election, in different ways, is affected by the superior influence of the upper orders; and the great mass (occasionally and justly complaining) are, beyond all doubt, better pleased than if they had no votes at all. The lower orders always have it in their power to rebel against their superiors; and occasionally they will do so, and have done so, and occasionally and justly carried elections* against gold,

* The 400 or 500 voting against the 200 are right about as often as juries are right in differing from judges; and that is very seldom.

and birth, and education. But it is madness to make laws of society which attempt to shake off the great laws of nature. As long as men love bread, and mutton, and broad cloth, wealth, in a long series of years, must have enormous effects upon human affairs, and the strong box will beat the ballot box. Mr. Grote has both, but he miscalculates their respective powers. Mr. Grote knows the relative values of gold and silver; but by what moral rate of exchange is he able to tell us the relative values of liberty and truth?

It is hardly necessary to say anything about universal suffrage, as there is no act of folly or madness which it may not in the beginning produce. There would be the greatest risk that the monarchy, as at present constituted, the funded debt, the established church, titles, and hereditary peerage, would give way before it. Many really honest men may wish for these changes; I know, or at least believe, that wheat and barley would grow if there were no Archbishop of Canterbury, and domestic fowls would breed if our Viscount Melbourne was again called Mr. Lamb; but they have stronger nerves than I have who would venture to bring these changes about. So few nations have been free, it is so difficult to guard freedom from kings, and mobs, and patriotic gentlemen; and we are in such a very tolerable state of happiness in England, that I think such changes would be very rash; and I have an utter mistrust in the sagacity and penetration of political reasoners who pretend to foresee all the consequences to which they would give birth. When I speak of the tolerable state of happiness in which we live in England, I do not speak merely of nobles, squires, and canons of St. Paul's, but of drivers of coaches, clerks in offices, carpenters, blacksmiths, butchers, and bakers, and most men who do not marry upon nothing, and become burdened with large families before they have arrived at years of maturity. The earth is not sufficiently fertile for this:

Difficilem victum fundit durissima tellus.

After all, the great art in politics and war is to choose a good position for making a stand. The Duke of Wellington examined and fortified the lines of Torres Vedras a year before he had any occasion to make use of them, and he had previously marked out Waterloo as the probable scene of some future exploit. The people seem to be hurrying on through all the well known steps to anarchy; they must be stopped at some pass or another: the first is the best and the most easily defended, The people have a right to ballot or to anything else which will make them happy; and they have a right to *nothing which will make them unhappy.* They are the best judges of their immediate gratifications, and the worst judges of what would best conduce to their interests for a series of years. Most earnestly and conscientiously wishing their good, I say,

No Ballot.

Sydney Smith.

LETTER

TO

LEONARD HORNER, ESQ.

—♦—

My dear Sir,

You desire me to commit to paper my recollections of your brother, Francis Horner. I think that the many years which have elapsed since his death have not at all impaired my memory of his virtues, at the same time that they have afforded me more ample means of comparing him with other important human beings with whom I have become acquainted since that period.

I first made the acquaintance of Francis Horner at Edinburgh, where he was among the most conspicuous young men in that energetic and infragrant city. My desire to know him proceeded first of all from being cautioned against him by some excellent and feeble people to whom I had brought letters of introduction, and who represented him to me as a person of violent political opinions; I interpreted this to mean a person who thought for himself — who had firmness enough to take his own line in life, and who loved truth better than he loved Dundas, at that time the tyrant of Scotland. I found my interpretation to be just, and from thence till the period of his death we lived in constant society and friendship with each other.

There was something very remarkable in his countenance — the commandments were written on his face, and I have often told him there was not a crime he might not commit with impunity, as no judge or jury who saw him would give the smallest degree of credit to any evidence against him: there was in his look a calm settled love of all that was honourable and good — an air of wisdom and of sweetness; you saw at once that he was a great man, whom nature had intended for a leader of human beings; you ranged yourself willingly under his banners, and cheerfully submitted to his sway.

He had an intense love of knowledge; he wasted very little of the portion of life conceded to him, and was always improving himself, not in the most foolish of all schemes of education, in making long and short verses and scanning Greek choruses, but in the masculine pursuits of the philosophy of legislation, of political economy, of the constitutional history of the country, and of the history and changes of Ancient and Modern Europe. He had read so much, and so well, that he was a contemporary of all men, and a citizen of all states.

I never saw any person who took such a lively interest in the daily happiness of his friends. If you were unwell, if there was a sick child in the nursery, if any death happened in your family, he never forgot you for an instant! You always found there was a man with a good heart who was never far from you.

He loved truth so much, that he never could bear any jesting upon important subjects. I remember one evening the late Lord Dudley and myself pretended to justify the conduct of the government in stealing the Danish fleet; we carried

on the argument with some wickedness against our graver friend; he could not stand it, but bolted indignantly out of the room; we flung up the sash, and, with loud peals of laughter, professed ourselves decided Scandinavians; we offered him not only the ships, but all the shot, powder, cordage, and even the biscuit, if he would come back: but nothing could turn him; he went home; and it took us a fortnight of serious behaviour before we were forgiven.

Francis Horner was a very modest person, which men of great understanding seldom are. It was his habit to confirm his opinion by the opinions of others; and often to form them from the same source.

His success in the House of Commons was decided and immediate, and went on increasing to the last day of his life. Though put into Parliament by some of the Great Borough Lords, every one saw that he represented his own real opinions: without hereditary wealth, and known as a writer in the Edinburgh Review, his independence was never questioned: his integrity, sincerity, and moderation, were acknowledged by all sides, and respected even by those impudent assassins who live only to discourage honesty and traduce virtue. The House of Commons, as a near relation of mine* once observed, has more good taste than any man in it. Horner, from his manners, his ability, and his integrity, became a general favourite with the House; they suspended for him their habitual dislike of lawyers, of political adventurers, and of young men of *conseederable taalents* from the North.

Your brother was wholly without pretensions or affectation. I have lived a long time in Scotland, and have seen very few affected Scotchmen; of those few he certainly was not one. In the ordinary course of life, he never bestowed a thought upon the effect he was producing; he trusted to his own good nature and good intentions, and left the rest to chance.

Having known him well before he had acquired a great London reputation, I never observed that his fame produced the slightest alteration in his deportment: he was as affable to me, and to all his old friends, as when we were debating metaphysics in a garret in Edinburgh. I don't think it was in the power of ermine, or mace, or seals, or lawn, or lace, or of any of those emblems and ornaments with which power loves to decorate itself, to have destroyed the simplicity of his character. I believe it would have defied all the corrupting appellations of human vanity: Serene, Honourable, Right Honourable, Sacred, Reverend, Right Reverend, Lord High, Earl, Marquis, Lord Mayor, Your Grace, Your Honour, and every other vocable which folly has invented and idolatry cherished, would all have been lavished on him in vain.

The character of his understanding was the exercise of vigorous reasoning, in pursuit of important and difficult truth. He had no wit; nor did he condescend to that inferior variety of this electric talent which prevails occasionally in the North, and which, under the name of *Wut*, is so infinitely distressing to persons of good taste: he had no very ardent and poetical imagination, but he had that innate force, which,

> —— Quemvis perferre laborem
> Suasit, et induxit noctes vigilare serenas
> Quærentem dictis quibus, et quo carmine demum
> Clara suæ possit præpandere lumina menti.

Your late excellent father, though a very well informed person, was not what would be called a literary man, and you will readily concede to me that none of his family would pretend to rival your brother in point of talents. I never saw more constant and high principled attention to parents than in his instance; more habitual and respectful deference to their opinions and wishes. I never saw brothers and sisters, over whom he might have assumed a family sovereignty, treated with more cheerful, and endearing equality. I mention these things, because men who do good things are so much more valuable than those who

* Mr. Sydney Smith's brother, the late Mr. Robert Smith.

say wise ones; because the order of human excellence is so often inverted, and great talents considered as an excuse for the absence of obscure virtues.

Francis Horner was always very guarded in his political opinions; guarded I mean against the excesses into which so many young men of talents were betrayed by their admiration of the French Revolution. He was an English Whig, and no more than an English Whig. He mourned sincerely over the crimes, and madness of France, and never for a single moment surrendered his understanding to the novelty and nonsense which infested the world at that strange era of human affairs.

I remember the death of many eminent Englishmen, but I can safely say, I never remember an impression so general as that excited by the death of Francis Horner. The public looked upon him as a powerful and a safe man, who was labouring not for himself or his party, but for them. They were convinced of his talents, they confided in his moderation, and they were sure of his motives; he had improved so quickly, and so much, that his early death was looked on as the destruction of a great statesman, who had done but a small part of the good which might be expected from him, who would infallibly have risen to the highest offices, and as infallibly have filled them to the public good. Then as he had never lost a friend, and made so few enemies, there was no friction, no drawback; public feeling had its free course; the image of a good and great man was broadly before the world, unsullied by any breath of hatred; there was nothing but pure sorrow! Youth destroyed before its time, great talents and wisdom hurried to the grave, a kind and good man, who might have lived for the glory of England, torn from us in the flower of his life!—but all this is gone and past, and, as Galileo said of his lost sight, "It has pleased God it should be so, and it must please me also."

Ever truly yours,

SYDNEY SMITH.

August 26, 1842.

LETTERS ON RAILWAYS.

"LOCKING IN" ON RAILWAYS.

To the Editor of the Morning Chronicle.

SIR,

IT falls to my lot to travel frequently on the Great Western Railway, and I request permission, through the medium of your able and honest journal, to make a complaint against the directors of that company.

It is the custom on that railway to lock the passengers in on both sides—a custom which, in spite of the dreadful example at Paris, I have every reason to believe they mean to continue without any relaxation.

In the course of a long life I have no recollection of any accident so shocking as that on the Paris railway—a massacre so sudden, so full of torment—death at the moment of pleasure—death aggravated by all the amazement, fear, and pain which can be condensed into the last moments of existence.

Who can say that the same scene may not be acted over again on the Great Western Railroad? That in the midst of their tunnel of three miles' length the same scene of slaughter and combustion may not scatter dismay and alarm over the whole country?

It seems to me perfectly monstrous that a board of ten or twelve monopo-

lists can read such a description, and say to the public, "You must run your chance of being burnt or mutilated. We have arranged our plan upon the locking-in system, and we shall not incur the risk and expense of changing it."

The plea is, that rash or drunken people will attempt to get out of the carriages which are not locked, and that this measure really originates from attention to the safety of the public; so that the lives of two hundred persons who are not drunk and are not rash, are to be endangered for the half-yearly preservation of some idiot, upon whose body the coroner is to sit, and over whom the sudden-death man is to deliver his sermon against the directors.

The very fact of locking the doors will be a frequent source of accidents. Mankind, whatever the directors may think of that process, are impatient of combustion. The Paris accident will never be forgotten. The passengers will attempt to escape through the windows, and ten times more of mischief will be done than if they had been left to escape by the doors in the usual manner.

It is not only the locking of the doors which is to be deprecated; but the effects which it has upon the imagination. Women, old people, and the sick, are all forced to travel by the railroad; and for 200 miles they live under the recollection not only of impending danger, but under the knowledge that escape is impossible — a journey comes to be contemplated with horror. Men cannot persuade the females of their family to travel by the railroad; it is inseparably connected with abominable tyranny and perilous imprisonment.

Why does the necessity of locking both doors exist only on the Great Western? Why is one of the doors left open on all other railways?

The public have a right to every advantage under permitted monopoly which they would enjoy under free competition; and they are unjust to themselves if they do not insist upon this right. If there were two parallel railways, the one locking you in, and the other not, is there the smallest doubt which would carry away all the business? Can there be any hesitation in which timid women, drunken men, sages, philosophers, bishops, and all combustible beings, would place themselves.

I very much doubt the legality of locking doors, and refusing to open them. I arrive at a station where others are admitted; but I am not suffered to get out, though perhaps at the point of death. In all other positions of life there is egress where there is ingress. Man is universally the master of his own body, except he chooses to go from Paddington to Bridgewater: there only the Habeas Corpus is refused.

Nothing, in fact, can be more utterly silly or mistaken than this over-officious care of the public; as if every man who was not a railway director was a child or a fool. But why stop here? Why are not strait-waistcoats used? Why is not the accidental traveller strapped down? Why do contusion and fracture still remain physically possible?

Is not this extreme care of the public new? When first mail coaches began to travel twelve miles an hour, the *outsides* (if I remember rightly) were never tied to the roof. In packets, landsmen are not locked into the cabin to prevent them from tumbling overboard. This affectionate nonsense prevails only on the Great Western. It is there only that men, women, and children (seeking the only mode of transit which remains) are by these tender-hearted monopolists immediately committed to their locomotive prisons. Nothing can, in fact, be so absurd as all this officious zeal. It is the duty of the directors to take all reasonable precautions to warn the public of danger — to make it clear that there is no negligence on the part of the railroad directors; and then, this done, if a fool-hardy person choose to expose himself to danger, so be it. Fools there will be on roads of iron and on roads of gravel, and they must suffer for their folly; but why are Socrates, Solon, and Solomon to be locked up?

But is all this, which appears so philanthropical, mere philanthropy? Does not the locking of the doors save servants and policemen? Does not economy mingle with these benevolent feelings? Is it to save a few fellow-creatures, or a few pounds, that the children of the West are to be hermetically sealed in the locomotives? I do not say it is so; but I say it deserves a very serious examination whether it be so or not. Great and heavy is the sin of the directors of this huge monopoly, if they repeat upon their own iron the tragedy of Paris, in order to increase their dividends a few shillings per cent.

The country has (perhaps inevitably) given way to this great monopoly. Nothing can make it tolerable for a moment but the most severe and watchful jealousy of the manner in which its powers are exercised. We shall have tyrannical rules, vexatious rules, ill temper, pure folly, and meddling and impertinent paternity. It is the absolute duty of Lord Ripon and Mr. Gladstone (if the directors prove themselves to be so inadequate to the new situation in which they are placed) to restrain and direct them by law; and if these two gentlemen are afraid of the responsibility of such laws, they are deficient in the moral courage which their office requires, and the most important interests of the public are neglected.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

SYDNEY SMITH.

May 21, 1842.

"LOCKING IN" ON RAILWAYS.

To the Editor of the Morning Chronicle.

SIR,

SINCE the letter upon railroads, which you were good enough to insert in your paper, I have had some conversation with two gentlemen officially connected with the Great Western. Though nothing could be more courteous than their manner, nor more intelligible than their arguments, I remain unshaken as to the necessity of keeping the doors open.

There is, in the first place, the effect of imagination, the idea that all escape is impossible, that (let what will happen) you must sit quiet in first class No. 2, whether they are pounding you into a jam, or burning you into a cinder, or crumbling you into a human powder. These excellent directors, versant in wood and metal, seem to require that the imagination should be sent by some other conveyance, and that only loads of unimpassioned, unintellectual flesh and blood should be darted along on the Western rail; whereas, the female *homo* is a screaming, parturient, interjectional, hysterical animal, whose delicacy and timidity, monopolists (even much as it may surprise them) must be taught to consult. The female, in all probability, never would jump out; but she thinks she may jump out when she pleases; and this is intensely comfortable.

There are two sorts of dangers which hang over railroads. The one retail dangers, where individuals only are concerned; the other, wholesale dangers, where the whole train, or a considerable part of it, is put in jeopardy. For the first danger there is a remedy in the prudence of individuals; for the second, there is none. No man need be drunk, nor need he jump out when the carriage is in motion; but in the present state of science it is impossible to guard effectually against the fracture of the axle-tree, or the explosion of the engine; and if the safety of the one party cannot be consulted but by the danger of the other, if the foolish cannot be restrained but by the unjust incarceration of the wise, the prior consideration is due to those who have not the remedy for the evil in their own hands.

But the truth is — and so (after a hundred monopolising experiments on public patience) the railroad directors will find it — there can be no other dependence for the safety of the public than the care which every human being is inclined to take of his own life and limbs. Everything beyond this is the mere lazy tyranny of monopoly, which makes no distinction between human beings and brown paper parcels.

If riding were a monopoly, as travelling in carriages is now become, there are many gentlemen whom I see riding in the Park upon such false principles, that I am sure the cantering and galloping directors would strap them, in the ardour of their affection, to the saddle, padlock them to the stirrups, or compel them to ride behind a policeman of the stable; and nothing but a motion from O'Brien, or an order from Gladstone, could release them.

Let the company stick up all sorts of cautions and notices within their carriages and without; but, after that, no doors locked. If one door is allowed to be locked, the other will soon be so too; there is no other security to the public than absolute prohibition of the practice. The directors and agents of the Great Western are individually excellent men; but the moment men meet in public boards, they cease to be collectively excellent. The fund of morality becomes less, as the individual contributors increase in number. I do not accuse such respectable men of any wilful violation of truth, but the memoirs which they are about to present will be, without the scrupulous cross-examination of a committee of the House of Commons, mere waste paper.

But the most absurd of all legislative enactments is this hemiplegian law—an act of Parliament to protect one side of the body and not the other. If the wheel comes off on the right, the open door is uppermost, and every one is saved. If, from any sudden avalanche on the road, the carriage is prostrated to the left, the locked door is uppermost, all escape is impossible, and the railroad martyrdom begins.

Leave me to escape in the best way I can, as the fire-offices very kindly permit me to do. I know very well the danger of getting out on the off-side; but escape is the affair of a moment; suppose a train to have passed at that moment, I know I am safe from any other trains for twenty minutes or half an hour; and if I do get out on the off-side, I do not remain in the valley of death between the two trains, but am over to the opposite bank in an instant—only half-roasted, or merely browned, certainly not done enough for the Great Western directors.

On Saturday morning last, the wheel of the public carriage, in which a friend of mine was travelling, began to smoke, but was pacified by several buckets of water, and proceeded. After five more miles, the whole carriage was full of smoke, the train was with difficulty stopped, and the flagrant vehicle removed. The axle was nearly in two, and in another mile would have been severed.

Railroad travelling is a delightful improvement of human life. Man is become a bird; he can fly longer and quicker than a Solan goose. The mamma rushes sixty miles in two hours to the aching finger of her conjugating and declining grammar boy. The early Scotchman scratches himself in the morning mists of the North, and has his porridge in Piccadilly before the setting sun. The Puseyite priest, after a rush of 100 miles, appears with his little volume of nonsense at the breakfast of his bookseller. Everything is near, everything is immediate—time, distance, and delay are abolished. But, though charming and fascinating as all this is, we must not shut our eyes to the price we shall pay for it. There will be every three or four years some dreadful massacre—whole trains will be hurled down a precipice, and 200 or 300 persons will be killed on the spot. There will be every now and then a great combustion of human bodies, as there has been at Paris; then all the newspapers up in arms—a thousand regulations, forgotten as soon as the directors dare—loud screams of the velocity whistle—monopoly locks and bolts, as before.

The locking plea of directors is philanthrophy; and I admit that to guard men from the commission of moral evil is as philanthropical as to prevent physical suffering. There is, I allow, a strong propensity in mankind to travel on railroads without paying; and to lock mankind in till they have completed their share of the contract is benevolent, because it guards the species from degrading and immoral

conduct, but to burn or crush a whole train merely to prevent a few immoral insides from not paying, is I hope a little more than Ripon or Gladstone will bear.

We have been, up to this point, very careless of our railway regulations. The first person of rank who is killed will put everything in order, and produce a code of the most careful rules. I hope it will not be one of the bench of bishops; but should it be so destined, let the burnt bishop—the unwilling Latimer — remember that, however painful gradual concoction by fire may be, his death will produce unspeakable benefit to the public. Even Sodor and Man will be better than nothing. From that moment the bad effects of the monopoly are destroyed; no more fatal deference to the directors; no despotic incarceration, no barbarous inattention to the anatomy and physiology of the human body; no commitment to locomotive prisons with warrant. We shall then find it possible

"Voyager libre sans mourir."

SYDNEY SMITH.

June 7, 1842.

BURNING ALIVE ON RAILROADS.

To the Editor of the Morning Chronicle.

SIR,

HAVING gradually got into this little controversy respecting the burning human beings alive on the railroads, I must beg leave, preparatory to the introduction of the bill, to say a few more words on the subject. If I could have my will in these matters, I would introduce into the bill a clause absolutely prohibitory of all locking doors on railroads; but as that fascinating board, the Board of Trade, does not love this, and as the public may, after some repetitions of roasted humanity, be better prepared for such peremptory legislation, the better method perhaps will be to give to the Board of Trade the power of opening doors (one or both), with the customary penalties against the companies for disobedience of orders, and then the board may use this power as the occasion may require.

To pass a one-legged law, giving power over one door and not the other, would, perhaps, be too absurd for human endurance. If railroad companies were aware of their real and extended interests, they would not harass the public by vexatious regulations, nor, under the plea of humanity (though really for purposes of economy), expose them to serious peril. The country are very angry with themselves for having granted the monopoly, and very angry for the instances of carelessness and oppression which have appeared in the working of the system: the heaviest fines are inflicted by coroner's juries, the heaviest damages are given by common juries. Railroads have daily proofs of their unpopularity. If Parliament get out of temper with these metallic ways, they will visit them with Laws of Iron, and burst upon them with the high pressure of despotism.

The wayfaring men of the North will league with the wayfaring men of the West; South and East will join hand in hand against them. All the points of the compass will combine against these vendors of velocity, and traders in transition. I hope a clause will be introduced, compelling the Board of Trade to report twice a year to Parliament upon the accidents of railroads, their causes, and their prevention. The public know little or nothing of what happens on the rail. All the men with letters upon the collars of their coats are sworn to secrecy — nothing can be extracted from them; when anything happens they neither appear to see nor hear you.

In case of conflagration, you would be to them as so many joints on the spit. It has occurred to 500 persons, that soft impediments behind and before (such as wool) would prevent the dangers of meeting or overtaking. It is not yet understood why a carriage on fire at the end of the train cannot be seen by the driver of the engine. All this may be great nonsense; but the public ought to know that these

points have been properly considered; they should know that there are a set of officers paid to watch over their interests, and to guard against the perpetual encroachments, the carelessness, the insolence, and the avarice of monopoly.

Why do not our dear Ripon and our youthful Gladstone see this, and come cheerfully to the rescue? and, instead of wrapping themselves up in transcendental philosophy, and the principles of letting-aloneness, why do they not at once do what ought to be done — what must be done — and what, after many needless butcheries, they will at last be compelled to do? — Yours,

SYDNEY SMITH.

June 18, 1842.

LETTERS, ETC.

ON

AMERICAN DEBTS.

THE HUMBLE PETITION *of the* REV. SYDNEY SMITH *to the* HOUSE OF CONGRESS *at* WASHINGTON.

I PETITION your honourable House to institute some measures for the restoration of American credit, and for the repayment of debts incurred and repudiated by several of the States. Your Petitioner lent to the State of Pennsylvania a sum of money, for the purpose of some public improvement. The amount, though small, is to him important, and is a saving from a life income, made with difficulty and privation. If their refusal to pay (from which a very large number of English families are suffering) had been the result of war, produced by the unjust aggression of powerful enemies; if it had arisen from civil discord; if it had proceeded from an improvident application of means in the first years of self-government: if it were the act of a poor State struggling against the barrenness of nature — every friend of America would have been contented to wait for better times; but the fraud is committed in the profound peace of Pennsylvania, by the richest State in the Union, after the wise investment of the borrowed money in roads and canals, of which the repudiators are every day reaping the advantage. It is an act of bad faith which (all its circumstances considered) has no parallel, and no excuse.

Nor is it only the loss of property which your Petitioner laments; he laments still more that immense power which the bad faith of America has given to aristocratical opinions, and to the enemies of free institutions, in the old world. It is in vain any longer to appeal to history, and to point out the wrongs which the many have received from the few. The Americans, who boast to have improved the institutions of the old world, have at least equalled its crimes. A great nation, after trampling under foot all earthly tyranny, has been guilty of a fraud as enormous as ever disgraced the worst king of the most degraded nation of Europe.

It is most painful to your Petitioner to see that American citizens excite, wherever they may go, the recollection that they belong to a dishonest people, who pride themselves on having tricked

and pillaged Europe; and this mark is fixed by their faithless legislators on some of the best and most honourable men in the world, whom every Englishman has been eager to see and proud to receive.

It is a subject of serious concern to your Petitioner that you are losing all that power which the friends of freedom rejoiced that you possessed, looking upon you as the ark of human happiness, and the most splendid picture of justice and of wisdom that the world had yet seen. Little did the friends of America expect it, and sad is the spectacle to see you rejected by every State in Europe, as a nation with whom no contract can be made, because none will be kept; unstable in the very foundations of social life, deficient in the elements of good faith, men who prefer any load of infamy however great, to any pressure of taxation however light.

Nor is it only this gigantic bankruptcy for so many degrees of longitude and latitude which your Petitioner deplores, but he is alarmed also by that total want of shame with which these things have been done; the callous immorality with which Europe has been plundered, that deadness of the moral sense which seems to preclude all return to honesty, to perpetuate this new infamy, and to threaten its extension over every State of the Union.

To any man of real philanthropy, who receives pleasure from the improvements of the world, the repudiation of the public debts of America, and the shameless manner in which it has been talked of and done, is the most melancholy event which has happened during the existence of the present generation. Your Petitioner sincerely prays that the great and good men still existing among you may, by teaching to the United States the deep disgrace they have incurred in the whole world, restore them to moral health, to that high position they have lost, and which, for the happiness of mankind, it is so important they should ever maintain; for the United States are now working out the greatest of all political problems, and upon that confederacy the eyes of thinking men are intensely fixed, to see how far the mass of mankind can be trusted with the management of their own affairs, and the establishment of their own happiness.

May 18, 1843.

LETTER I.

To the Editor of the Morning Chronicle.

Sir,

You did me the favour, some time since, to insert in your valuable journal a petition of mine to the American Congress, for the repayment of a loan made by me, in common with many other unwise people, to the State of Pennsylvania. For that petition I have been abused in the grossest manner by many of the American papers. After some weeks' reflection, I see no reason to alter my opinions, or to retract my expressions. What I then said was not wild declamation, but measured truth. I repeat again, that no conduct was ever more profligate than that of the State of Pennsylvania. History cannot pattern it: and let no deluded being imagine that they will ever repay a single farthing — their people have tasted of the dangerous luxury of dishonesty, and they will never be brought back to the homely rule of right. The money transactions of the Americans are become a by-word among the nations of Europe. In every grammar-school of the old world *ad Græcas Calendas* is translated — the American dividends.

I am no enemy to America. I loved and admired honest America when she respected the laws of pounds, shillings, and pence; and I thought the United States the most magnificent picture of human happiness: I meddle now in these matters because I hate fraud — because I pity the misery it has occasioned — because I mourn over the hatred it has excited against free institutions.

Among the discussions to which the

moral lubricities of this insolvent people have given birth, they have arrogated to themselves the right of sitting in judgment upon the property of their creditors — of deciding who among them is rich, and who poor, and who are proper objects of compassionate payment; but in the name of Mercury, the great god of thieves, did any man ever hear of debtors alleging the wealth of the lender as a reason for eluding the payment of the loan? Is the Stock Exchange a place for the tables of the money-lenders; or is it a school of moralists, who may amerce the rich, exalt the poor, and correct the inequalities of fortune. Is *Biddle* an instrument in the hand of Providence to exalt the humble, and send the rich empty away? Does American Providence work with such instruments as *Biddle?*

But the only good part of this bad morality is not acted upon. The rich are robbed, but the poor are not paid: they growl against the dividends of Dives, and don't lick the sores of Lazarus. They seize with loud acclamations on the money bags of Jones Loyd, Rothschild, and Baring, but they do not give back the pittance of the widow, and the bread of the child. Those knaves of the setting sun may call me rich, for I have a twentieth part of the income of the Archbishop of Canterbury; but the curate of the next parish is a wretched soul, bruised by adversity; and the three hundred pounds for his children, which it has taken his life to save, is eaten and drunken by the mean men of Pennsylvania — by men who are always talking of the virtue and honour of the United States — by men who soar above others in what they say, and sink below all nations in what they do — who, after floating on the heaven of declamation, fall down to feed on the offal and garbage of the earth.

Persons who are not in the secret are inclined to consider the abominable conduct of the repudiating States to proceed from exhaustion — "They don't pay because they cannot pay;" whereas, from estimates which have just now reached this country, this is the picture of the finances of the insolvent States. Their debts may be about 200 millions of dollars; at an interest of 6 per cent., this makes an annual charge of 12 millions of dollars, which is little more than 1 per cent. of their income in 1840, and may be presumed to be less than 1 per cent. of their present income; but if they were all to provide funds for the punctual payment of interest, the debt could readily be converted into a 4 or 5 per cent. stock, and the excess, converted into a sinking fund, would discharge the debt in less than thirty years. The debt of Pennsylvania, estimated at 40 millions of dollars, bears, at 5 per cent., an annual interest of 2 millions. The income of this State was, in 1840, 131 millions of dollars, and is probably at this time not less than 150 millions: a nett revenue of only 1½ per cent. would produce the two millions required. So that the price of national character in Pennsylvania is 1½ per cent. on the nett income; and if this market price of morals were established here, a gentleman of a thousand a year would deliberately and publicly submit to infamy for 15*l.* per annum; and a poor man, who by laborious industry had saved one hundred a year, would incur general disgrace and opprobrium for thirty shillings by the year. There really should be lunatic asylums for nations as well as for individuals.

But they begin to feel all this: their tone is changed; they talk with bated breath and whispering apology, and allay with some cold drops of modesty their skipping spirit. They strutted into this miserable history, and begin to think of sneaking out.

And then the subdolous press of America contends that the English under similar circumstances would act with their own debt in the same manner; but there are many English constituencies where are thousands not worth a shilling, and no such idea has been broached among them, nor has any petition to such effect been presented to the legislature. But what if they did act in such a manner,

wou'd it be a conduct less wicked than that of the Americans? Is there not one immutable law of justice — is it not written in the book? Does it not beat in the heart? — are the great guide-marks of life to be concealed by such nonsense as this? I deny the fact on which the reasoning is founded; and if the facts were true, the reasoning would be false.

I never meet a Pennsylvanian at a London dinner without feeling a disposition to seize and divide him; — to allot his beaver to one sufferer and his coat to another — to appropriate his pocket-handkerchief to the orphan, and to comfort the widow with his silver watch, Broadway rings, and the London Guide, which he always carries in his pockets. How such a man can set himself down at an English table without feeling that he owes two or three pounds to every man in company I am at a loss to conceive: he has no more right to eat with honest men than a leper has to eat with clean men. If he have a particle of honour in his composition he should shut himself up, and say, "I cannot mingle with you, I belong to a degraded people — I must hide myself — I am a plunderer from Pennsylvania."

Figure to yourself a Pennsylvanian receiving foreigners in his own country, walking over the public works with them, and showing them Larcenous Lake, Swindling Swamp, Crafty Canal, and Rogues' Railway, and other dishonest works. "This swamp we gained (says the patriotic borrower) by the repudiated loan of 1828. Our canal robbery was in 1830; we pocketed your good people's money for the railroad only last year." All this may seem very smart to the Americans; but if I had the misfortune to be born among such a people, the land of my fathers should not retain me a single moment after the act of repudiation. I would appeal from my fathers to my forefathers. I would fly to Newgate for greater purity of thought, and seek in the prisons of England for better rules of life.

This new and vain people can never forgive us for having preceded them 300 years in civilisation. They are prepared to enter into the most bloody wars in England, not on account of Oregon, or boundaries, or right of search, but because our clothes and carriages are better made, and because Bond Street beats Broadway. Wise Webster does all he can to convince the people that these are not lawful causes of war; but wars, and long wars, they will one day or another produce; and this, perhaps, is the only advantage of repudiation. The Americans cannot gratify their avarice and ambition at once; they cannot cheat and conquer at the same time. The warlike power of every country depends on their Three per Cents. If Cæsar were to reappear upon earth, Wettenhall's list would be more important than his Commentaries; Rothschild would open and shut the temple of Janus; Thomas Baring, or Bates, would probably command the Tenth Legion, and the soldiers would march to battle with loud cries of Scrip and Omnium reduced, Consols, and Cæsar! Now, the Americans have cut themselves off from all resources of credit. Having been as dishonest as they can be, they are prevented from being as foolish as they wish to be. In the whole habitable globe they cannot borrow a guinea, and they cannot draw the sword because they have not money to buy it.

If I were an American of any of the honest States, I would never rest till I had compelled Pennsylvania to be as honest as myself. The bad faith of that State brings disgrace on all; just as common snakes are killed because vipers are dangerous. I have a general feeling, that by that breed of men I have been robbed and ruined, and I shudder and keep aloof. The pecuniary credit of every State is affected by Pennsylvania. Ohio pays; but with such a bold bankruptcy before their eyes how long will Ohio pay? The truth is, that the eyes of all capitalists are averted from the United States. The finest commercial understandings will have nothing to do with them. Men rigidly just, who

penetrate boldly into the dealings of nations, and work with vigour and virtue for honourable wealth — great and high-minded merchants — will loathe, and are now loathing, the name of America: it is becoming, since its fall, the common-sewer of Europe, and the native home of the needy villain.

And now, drab-coloured men of Pennsylvania, there is yet a moment left: the eyes of all Europe are anchored upon you —

"Surrexit mundus justis furiis:"

start up from that trance of dishonesty into which you are plunged; don't think of the flesh which walls about your life, but of that sin which has hurled you from the heaven of character, which hangs over you like a devouring pestilence, and makes good men sad, and ruffians dance and sing. It is not for Gin Sling and Sherry Cobbler alone that man is to live, but for those great principles against which no argument can be listened to — principles which give to every power a double power above their functions and their offices, which are the books, the arts, the academies that teach, lift up, and nourish the world — principles (I am quite serious in what I say) above cash, superior to cotton, higher than currency, — principles, without which it is better to die than to live, which every servant of God, over every sea and in all lands, should cherish — *usque ad abdita spiramenta animæ.*

Yours, &c.

SYDNEY SMITH.

Nov. 3, 1843.

LETTER II.

To the Editor of the Morning Chronicle.

SIR,

HAVING been unwell for some days past, I have had no opportunity of paying my respects to General Duff Green, who (whatever be his other merits), has certainly not shown himself a Washington in defence of his country. The General demands, with a beautiful simplicity, "*Whence this morbid hatred of America?*" But this question, all-affecting as it is, is stolen from Pilpay's fables: — "A fox," says Pilpay, "caught by the leg in a trap near the farm-yard, uttered the most piercing cries of distress: forthwith all the birds of the yard gathered round him, and seemed to delight in his misfortune; hens chuckled, geese hissed, ducks quacked, and chanticleer with shrill cockadoodles rent the air. 'Whence,' said the fox, limping forward with infinite gravity, 'whence this morbid hatred of the fox? What have I done? Whom have I injured? I am overwhelmed with astonishment at these symptoms of aversion.' 'Oh! you old villain,' the poultry exclaimed, 'Where are our ducklings? Where are our goslings? Did not I see you running away yesterday with my mother in your mouth? Did you not eat up all my relations last week? You ought to die the worst of deaths — to be pecked into a thousand pieces.'" Now hence, General Green, comes the morbid hatred of America, as you term it — because her conduct has been predatory — because she has ruined so many helpless children, so many miserable women, so many aged men — because she has disturbed the order of the world, and rifled those sacred treasures which human virtue had hoarded for human misery. Why is such hatred morbid? Why, is it not just, inevitable, innate? Why, is it not disgraceful to want it? Why, is it not honourable to feel it?

Hate America!!! I have loved and honoured America all my life; and in the *Edinburgh Review*, and at all opportunities which my trumpery sphere of action has afforded, I have never ceased to praise and defend the United States; and to every American to whom I have had the good fortune to be introduced, I have proffered all the hospitality in my power. But I cannot shut my eyes to enormous dishonesty; nor, remembering their former state, can I restrain myself from calling on them (though I copy Satan) to spring up from the gulf of infamy in which they are rolling, —

"Awake, arise, or be for ever fallen."

I am astonished that the honest States of America do not draw a *cordon sanitaire* round their unpaying brethren — that the truly mercantile New Yorkers, and the thoroughly honest people of Massachusetts, do not in their European visits wear an uniform with "S. S., or Solvent States," worked in gold letters upon the coat, and receipts in full of all demands tamboured on their waistcoats, and "our own property" figured on their pantaloons.

But the General seemed shocked that I should say the Americans cannot go to war without money: but what do I mean by war? Not irruptions into Canada — not the embodying of militia in Oregon; but a long, tedious, maritime war of four or five years' duration. Is any man so foolish as to suppose that Rothschild has nothing to do with such wars as these? and that a bankrupt State, without the power of borrowing a shilling in the world, may not be crippled in such a contest? We all know that the Americans can fight. Nobody doubts their courage. I see now in my mind's eye a whole army on the plains of Pennsylvania in battle array, immense corps of insolvent light infantry, regiments of heavy horse debtors, battalions of repudiators, brigades of bankrupts, with *Vivre sans payer, ou mourir*, on their banners, and *ære alieno* on their trumpets: all these desperate debtors would fight to the death for their country, and probably drive into the sea their invading creditors. Of their courage, I repeat again, I have no doubt. I wish I had the same confidence in their wisdom. But I believe they will become intoxicated by the flattery of unprincipled orators; and, instead of entering with us into a noble competition in making calico (the great object for which the Anglo-Saxon race appears to have been created), they will waste their happiness and their money (if they can get any) in years of silly, bloody, foolish, and accursed war, to prove to the world that Perkins is a real fine gentleman, and that the carronades of the Washington steamer will carry further than those of the Britisher Victoria, or the Robert Peel vessel of war.

I am accused of applying the epithet repudiation to States which have not repudiated. Perhaps so; but then these latter States have not paid. But what is the difference between a man who says, "I don't owe you anything, and will not pay you," and another who says, "I do owe you a sum," and who, having admitted the debt, never pays it? There seems in the first to be some slight colour of right; but the second is broad, blazing, refulgent, meridian fraud.

It may be very true that rich and educated men in Pennsylvania wish to pay the debt, and that the real objectors are the Dutch and German agriculturists, who cannot be made to understand the effect of character upon clover. All this may be very true, but it is a domestic quarrel. Their churchwardens of reputation must make a private rate of infamy for themselves — we have nothing to do with this rate. The real quarrel is the Unpaid World *versus* the State of Pennsylvania.

And now, dear Jonathan, let me beg of you to follow the advice of a real friend, who will say to you what Wat Tyler had not the virtue to say, and what all speakers in the eleven recent Pennsylvanian elections have cautiously abstained from saying, — "Make a great effort; book up at once, and pay." You have no conception of the obloquy and contempt to which you are exposing yourselves all over Europe. Bull is naturally disposed to love you, but he loves nobody who does not pay him. His imaginary paradise is some planet of punctual payment, where ready money prevails, and where debt and discount are unknown. As for me, as soon as I hear that the last farthing is paid to the last creditor, I will appear on my knees at the bar of the Pennsylvanian Senate in the plumeopicean robe of American controversy. Each Conscript Jonathan shall trickle over me a few drops of tar, and help to decorate me with those penal plumes in which

the vanquished reasoner of the transatlantic world does homage to the physical superiority of his opponents. And now, having eased my soul of its indignation, and sold my stock at 40 per cent. discount, I sulkily retire from the subject, with a fixed intention of lending no more money to free and enlightened republics, but of employing my money henceforth in buying up Abyssinian bonds, and purchasing into the Turkish Fours, or the Tunis Three-and-a-half per Cent. funds.

SYDNEY SMITH.

November 22, 1843.

MODERN CHANGES.

"The good of ancient times let others state,
I think it lucky I was born so late."

Mr. EDITOR,

IT is of some importance at what period a man is born. A young man, alive at this period, hardly knows to what improvements of human life he has been introduced; and I would bring before his notice the following eighteen changes which have taken place in England since I first began to breathe in it the breath of life—a period amounting now to nearly seventy-three years.

Gas was unknown: I groped about the streets of London in all but the utter darkness of a twinkling oil lamp, under the protection of watchmen in their grand climacteric, and exposed to every species of depredation and insult.

I have been nine hours in sailing from Dover to Calais before the invention of steam. It took me nine hours to go from Taunton to Bath before the invention of railroads, and I now go in six hours from Taunton to London! In going from Taunton to Bath, I suffered between 10,000 and 12,000 severe contusions, before stone-breaking Macadam was born.

I paid 15*l.* in a single year for repairs of carriage-springs on the pavement of London; and I now glide without noise or fracture, on wooden pavements.

I can walk, by the assistance of the police, from one end of London to the other, without molestation; or, if tired, get into a cheap and active cab, instead of those cottages on wheels, which the hackney coaches were at the beginning of my life.

I had no umbrella! There were little used, and very dear. There were no waterproof hats, and *my* hat has often been reduced by rains into its primitive pulp.

I could not keep my smallclothes in their proper place, for braces were unknown. If I had the gout, there was no colchicum. If I was bilious, there was no calomel. If I was attacked by ague, there was no quinine. There were filthy coffee-houses instead of elegant clubs. Game could not be bought. Quarrels about uncommuted tithes were endless. The corruption of Parliament, before Reform, infamous. There were no banks to receive the savings of the poor. The Poor Laws were gradually sapping the vitals of the country; and whatever miseries I suffered, I had no post to whisk my complaints for a single penny to the remotest corners of the empire; and yet, in spite of all these privations, I lived on quietly, and am now ashamed

that I was not more discontented, and utterly surprised that all these changes and inventions did not occur two centuries ago. Z.

I forgot to add, that as the basket of stage coaches, in which luggage was then carried, had no springs, your clothes were rubbed all to pieces; and that even in the best society one-third of the gentlemen at least were always drunk.

A FRAGMENT

ON

THE IRISH ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.

PREFACE.

The following unrevised fragment, found among the papers of the late Rev. Sydney Smith, if it serve no other purpose, will at least prove that his *last*, as well as his earliest efforts, were exerted for the promotion of religious freedom, and may satisfy those who have objected to his later writings, because his own interest appeared to be bound up with his opinions, that he did not hesitate to the last moment of his life, boldly to advocate what he considered to be justice to others.

April, 1845.

Private Memoranda of Subjects intended to have been introduced in the Pamphlet, &c.

Debates in the House of Commons in 1825, on the motion of Lord F. Egerton, for the support of the Roman Catholic clergy. Printed separately, I believe, in Ireland.

Evidence before the House of Commons in 1824 and 1825, including Doyle's.

A Speech of Charles Grant's in 1819, on a motion of James Daly to enforce the Insurrection Act.

Debates on Maynooth, in February last (1844).

Hard case of the priest's first year.

Provision offered by Pitt and Castlereagh, and accepted by the hierarchy.

*Send ambassadors to Constantinople, and refuse to send them to Rome.

England should cast off its connection with the Irish Church.

Lord F. Egerton's plan for paying the Roman Catholic clergy in 1825. The prelates agreed to take the money.

*Old mode of governing by Protestants at an end.

*Vast improvements since the Union, and fully specified in Martin, page 35.

*Priests dare not thwart the people for fear of losing money.

*Dreadful oppression of the people.

*Bishops dare not enforce their rules. They must have money.

* These subjects are treated of in the Fragment.

The revenue of the Irish Roman Catholic Church is made up of halfpence, potatoes, rags, bones, and fragments of old clothes; and those, Irish old clothes. They worship often in hovels, or in the open air, from the

want of any place of worship. Their religion is the religion of three-fourths of the population! Not far off, in a well-windowed and well-roofed house, is a well-paid Protestant clergyman, preaching to stools and hassocks, and crying in the wilderness; near him the clerk, near him the sexton, near him the sexton's wife—furious against the errors of Popery, and willing to lay down their lives for the great truths established at the Diet of Augsburg.

There is a story in the Leinster family which passes under the name of

"*She is not well.*"

A Protestant clergyman, whose church was in the neighbourhood, was a guest at the house of that upright and excellent man the Duke of Leinster. He had been staying there three or four days; and on Saturday night, as they were all retiring to their rooms, the Duke said, "We shall meet to-morrow at breakfast."—"Not so (said our Milesian Protestant); your hour, my lord, is a little too late for me; I am very particular in the discharge of my duty, and your breakfast will interfere with my church." The Duke was pleased with the very proper excuses of his guest, and they separated for the night;—his Grace perhaps deeming his palace more safe from all the evils of life for containing in its bosom such an exemplary son of the Church. The first person, however, whom the Duke saw in the morning upon entering the breakfast-room was our punctual Protestant, deep in rolls and butter, his finger in an egg, and a large slice of the best Tipperary ham secured on his plate. "Delighted to see you, my dear vicar," said the Duke, "but I must say as much surprised as delighted."—"Oh, don't you know what has happened?" said the sacred breakfaster,—"*She is not well.*"—"Who is not well?" said the Duke: "you are not married—you have no sister living—I'm quite uneasy; tell me who is not well."—"Why the fact is, my lord Duke, that my congregation consists of the clerk, the sexton, and the sexton's wife. Now the sexton's wife is in very delicate health: when she cannot attend, we cannot muster the number mentioned in the rubric; and we have, therefore, no service on that day. The good woman had a cold and sore throat this morning, and, as I had breakfasted but slightly, I thought I might as well hurry back to the regular family dejeuner." I don't know that the clergyman behaved improperly; but such a church is hardly worth an insurrection and civil war every ten years.

Sir Robert did well in fighting it out with O'Connell. He was too late; but when he began he did it boldly and sensibly, and I, for one, am heartily glad O'Connell has been found guilty and imprisoned. He was either in earnest about Repeal, or he was not. If he *were* in earnest, I entirely agree with Lord Grey and Lord Spencer, that civil war is preferable to Repeal. Much as I hate wounds, dangers, privations, and explosions—much as I love regular hours of dinner—foolish as I think men covered with the feathers of the male *Pullus domesticus*, and covered with lace in the course of the ischiatic nerve—much as I detest all these follies, and ferocities, I would rather turn soldier myself than acquiesce quietly in such a separation of the empire.

It is *such* a piece of nonsense, that no man can have any reverence for himself who would stop to discuss such a question. It is such a piece of anti-British villany, that none but the bitterest enemy of our blood and people could entertain such a project! It is to be met only with round and grape—to be answered by Shrapnel and Congreve; to be discussed in hollow squares, and refuted by battalions four deep; to be put down by the *ultima ratio* of that armed Aristotle, the Duke of Wellington.

O'Connell is released; and released I have no doubt by the conscientious decision of the Law Lords. If he were unjustly (even from some technical defect) imprisoned, I rejoice in his liberation. England is, I believe, the *only* country in the world, where such an event *could* have happened, and a wise

Irishman (if there be a wise Irishman) should be slow in separating from a country whose spirit can produce, and whose institutions can admit, of such a result. Of his guilt no one doubts, but guilty men must be hung technically and according to established rules ; upon a statutable gibbet, with parliament rope, and a legal hangman, sheriff, and chaplain on the scaffold, and the mob in the foreground.

But, after all, I have no desire my dear Daniel should come to any harm, for I believe there is a great deal of virtue and excellent meaning in him, and I must now beg a few minutes' conversation with him. "After all, my dear Daniel, what is it you want ? —a separation of the two countries ? —for what purpose ?—for your own aggrandisement?—for the gratification of your personal vanity ? You don't know yourself ; you are much too honourable and moral a man, and too clear-sighted a person for such a business as this : the empire will be twisted out of your hands by a set of cut-throat villains, and you will die secretly by a poisoned potato, or be pistolled in the streets. You have too much sense and taste and openness to endure for a session the stupid and audacious wickedness and nonsense of your associates. If you want fame, you must be insatiable ! Who is so much known in all Europe, or so much admired by honest men for the *real* good you had done to your country, before this insane cry of Repeal ? And don't imagine you can intimidate this Government ; whatever be their faults or merits, you may take my word for it, you will *not* intimidate them. They will prosecute you again, and put down your Clontarf meetings, and they will be quite right in doing so. They *may* make concessions, and I think they will ; but they would fall into utter contempt if they allowed themselves to be terrified into a dissolution of the Union. They know full well that the English nation are unanimous and resolute upon this point, and that they would prefer war to a Repeal. And now, dear Daniel, sit down quietly at Derrynane, and tell me, when the bodily frame is refreshed with the wine of Bordeaux, whether all this be worth while. What is the object of all government ? The object of all government is roast mutton, potatoes, claret, a stout constable, an honest justice, a clear highway, a free chapel. What trash to be bawling in the streets about the Green Isle, the Isle of the Ocean ; the bold anthem of *Erin go bragh!* A far better anthem would be Erin go bread and cheese, Erin go cabins that will keep out the rain, Erin go pantaloons without holes in them ! What folly to be making eternal declamations about governing yourselves ! If laws are good and well administered, is it worth while to rush into war and rebellion in order that no better laws may be made in another place ? Are you an Eton boy, who has just come out, full of Plutarch's Lives, and considering in every case how Epaminondas or Philopœmen would have acted, or are you our own dear Daniel, drilled in all the business and bustle of life ? I am with you heart and soul in my detestation of all injustice done to Ireland. Your priests shall be fed and paid, the liberties of your Church be scrupulously guarded, and in civil affairs the most even justice be preserved between Catholic and Protestant. Thus far I am a thorough rebel as well as yourself ; but when you come to the perilous nonsense of *Repeal*, in common with every honest man who has five grains of common sense, I take my leave."

It is entertaining enough, that although the Irish are beginning to be so clamorous about making their own laws, the wisest and the best statutes in the books have been made since their union with England. All Catholic disabilities have been abolished ; a good police has been established all over the kingdom ; public courts of petty sessions have been instituted ; free trade between Great Britain and Ireland has been completely carried into effect ; lord-lieutenants are placed in every county ; church rates are taken off Catholic shoulders; the County Grand Jury Rooms are flung open to the public ; county surveyors are of great service ; a noble provision is made for

educating the people. I never saw a man who had returned to Ireland after four or five years' absence, who did not say how much it had improved, and how fast it was improving: and this is the country which is to be Erin-go-bragh'd by this shallow, vain, and irritable people into bloodshed and rebellion!

The first thing to be done is to pay the priests, and after a little time they will take the money. One man wants to repair his cottage; another wants a buggy; a third cannot shut his eyes to the dilapidations of a cassock. The draft is payable at sight in Dublin, or by agents in the next market town dependent upon the Commission in Dublin. The housekeeper of the holy man is importunate for money, and if it be not procured by drawing for the salary, it must be extorted by curses and comminations from the ragged worshippers, slowly, sorrowfully, and sadly. There will be some opposition at first, but the facility of getting the salary without the violence they are now forced to use, and the difficulties to which they are exposed in procuring the payment of those emoluments to which they are fairly entitled, will, in the end, overcome all obstacles. And if it do not succeed, what harm is done by the attempt? It evinces on the part of this country the strongest disposition to do what is just, and to apply the best remedy to the greatest evil; but the very attempt would do good, and would be felt in the great Catholic insurrection, come when it will. All rebellions and disaffections are general and terrible in proportion as one party has suffered, and the other inflicted;—any great measure of conciliation, proposed in the spirit of kindness, is remembered, and renders war less terrible, and opens avenues to peace.

The Roman Catholic priest could not refuse to draw his salary from the State without incurring the indignation of his flock. "Why are you to come upon us for all this money, when you can ride over to Sligo or Belfast, and draw a draft upon Government for the amount?" It is not easy to give a satisfactory answer to this, to a shrewd man who is starving to death.

Of course, in talking of a government payment to the Catholic priest, I mean it should be done with the utmost fairness and good faith; no attempt to gain patronage, or to make use of the Pope as a stalking-horse for playing tricks. Leave the patronage exactly as you find it; and take the greatest possible care that the Catholic clergy have no reason to suspect you in this particular; do it like gentlemen, without shuffling and prevarication, or leave it alone altogether.

The most important step in improvement which mankind ever made was the secession from the see of Rome, and the establishment of the Protestant religion; but though I have the sincerest admiration of the Protestant faith, I have no admiration of Protestant hassocks on which there are no knees, nor of seats on which there is no superincumbent Protestant pressure, nor of whole acres of tenantless Protestant pews, in which no human being of the 500 sects of Christians is ever seen. I have no passion for sacred emptiness, or pious vacuity. The emoluments of those livings in which there are few or no Protestants ought, after the death of the present incumbents, to be appropriated in part to the uses of the predominant religion, or some arrangements made for superseding such utterly useless ministers immediately, securing to them the emoluments they possess.

Can any honest man say, that in parishes (as is the case frequently in Ireland) containing 3000 or 4000 Catholics and 40 or 50 Protestants, there is the smallest chance of the majority being converted? Are not the Catholics (except in the North of Ireland, where the great mass are Presbyterians) gaining everywhere on the Protestants? The tithes were originally possessed by the Catholic Church of Ireland. Not one shilling of them is now devoted to that purpose. An immense majority of the common people are Catholics; they see a church richly supported by the spoils of their own church establish-

ments, in whose tenets not one tenth part of the people believe. Is it possible to believe this can endure?—that a light, irritable, priest-ridden people will not, under such circumstances, always remain at the very eve of rebellion, always ready to explode when the finger of Daniel touches the hair trigger?—for Daniel, be it said, though he hates shedding blood in small quantities, has no objection to provoking kindred nations to war. He very properly objects to killing or being killed by Lord Alvanley; but would urge on ten thousand Pats in civil combat against ten thousand Bulls. His objections are to small homicides; and his vow that he has registered in Heaven is only against retail destruction, and murder by piecemeal. He does not like to tease Satan by driblets; but to earn eternal torments by persuading eight million Irish and twelve million Britons no longer to buy and sell oats and salt meat, but to butcher each other in God's name to extermination. And what if Daniel dies,—of what use his death? Does Daniel make the occasion, or does the occasion make Daniel?—Daniels are made by the bigotry and insolence of England to Ireland; and till the monstrous abuses of the Protestant Church in that country are rectified, there will always *be* Daniels, and they will always come out of their dens more powerful and more popular than when you cast them in.

I do not mean by this, unjustly and cowardly to run down O'Connell. He has been of eminent service to his country in the question of Catholic Emancipation, and I am by no means satisfied that with the gratification of vanity there are not mingled genuine feelings of patriotism, and a deep sense of the injustice done to his country. His first success, however, flung him off his guard; and perhaps he trusted too much in the timidity of the present Government, who are by no means composed of irresolute or weak men.

If I thought Ireland quite safe, I should still object to injustice. I could never endure in silence that the Catholic Church of Ireland should be left in its present state; but I am afraid France and England can now afford to fight: and having saved a little money, they will, of course, spend it in fighting. That puppy of the waves, young Joinville, will steam over in a high-pressure fleet!—and then comes an immense twenty per cent. income-tax war, an universal insurrection in Ireland, and a crisis of misery and distress, in which life will hardly be worth having. The struggle *may* end in our favour, but it may *not;* and the object of political wisdom is to avoid these struggles. I want to see jolly Roman Catholic priests secure of their income, without any motive for sedition or turbulence. I want to see Patricks at the loom; cotton and silk factories springing up in the bogs; Ireland a rich, happy, quiet country!—scribbling, carding, cleaning, and making calico, as if mankind had only a few days more allotted to them for making clothes, and were ever after to remain stark naked.

Remember that between your impending and your past wars with Ireland, there is this remarkable difference. You have given up your Protestant auxiliaries; the Protestants enjoyed in former disputes all the patronage of Ireland; they fought not only from religious hatred, but to preserve their monopoly;—that monopoly is gone; you have been candid and just for thirty years, and have lost those friends whose swords were always ready to defend the partiality of the Government, and to stifle the cry of justice. The next war will not be between Catholic and Protestant, but between Ireland and England.

I have some belief in Sir Robert. He is a man of great understanding, and *must* see that this eternal O'Connelling will never do,—that it is impossible it can last. We are in a transition state, and the Tories may be assured that the Baronet will not go too fast. If Peel tells them that the thing must be done, they may be sure it is high time to do it;—they may retreat mournfully and sullenly before common justice and common sense, but retreat they *must* when

Tamworth gives the word,—and in quick-step too, and without loss of time.

And let me beg of my dear Ultras not to imagine that they survive for a single instant without Sir Robert—that they could form an Ultra-tory Administration. Is there a Chartist in Great Britain who would not, upon the first intimation of such an attempt, order a new suit of clothes, and call upon the baker and milkmen for an extended credit? Is there a political reasoner who would not come out of his hole with a new constitution? Is there one ravenous rogue who would not be looking for his prey? Is there one honest man of common sense who does not see that universal disaffection and civil war would follow from the blind fury, the childish prejudices, and the deep ignorance of such a sect? I have a high opinion of Sir Robert Peel, but he must summon up all his political courage, and do something next session for the payment of the Roman Catholic priests. He must run some risk of shocking public opinion; no greater risk, however, than he did in Catholic Emancipation. I am sure the Whigs would be true to him, and I think I observe that very many obtuse country gentlemen are alarmed by the state of Ireland and the hostility of France and America.

Give what you please to the Catholic priests, habits are not broken in a day. There must be time as well as justice, but in the end these things have their effect. A buggy, a house, some fields near it, a decent income paid quarterly; in the long run these are the cures of sedition and disaffection; men don't quit the common business of life and join bitter political parties unless they have something justly to complain of.

But where is the money—about 400,000*l.* per annum—to come from? Out of the pockets of that best of men, Mr. Thomas Grenville, out of the pockets of the Bishops, of Sir Robert Inglis, and all other men who pay all other taxes; and never will public money be so well and wisely employed!

It turns out that there is no law to prevent entering into diplomatic engagements with the Pope. The sooner we become acquainted with a gentleman who has so much to say to eight millions of our subjects the better! Can anything be so childish and absurd as a horror of communicating with the Pope, and all the hobgoblins we have imagined of premunires and outlawries for this contraband trade in piety? Our ancestors (strange to say wiser than ourselves) have left us to do as we please, and the sooner Government do, what they *can* do legally, the better. A thousand opportunities of doing good in Irish affairs have been lost, from our having no avowed and dignified agent at the Court of Rome. If it depended upon me, I would send the Duke of Devonshire there to-morrow, with nine chaplains and several tons of Protestant theology. I have no love of Popery, but the Pope is at all events better than the idol of Juggernaut, whose chaplains I believe we pay, and whose chariot I dare say is made in Long Acre. We pay 10,000*l.* a year to our ambassador at Constantinople, and are startled with the idea of communicating diplomatically with Rome, deeming the Sultan a better Christian than the Pope!

The mode of exacting clerical dues in Ireland is quite arbitrary and capricious. Uniformity is out of the question; everything depends on the disposition and temper of the clergyman. There are salutary regulations put forth in each diocese respecting church dues and church discipline, and put forth by episcopal and synodical authority. Specific sums are laid down for mass, marriage, and the administration of the Eucharist. These authorised payments are moderate enough; but every priest, in spite of these rules, makes the most he can of his ministry, and the strangest discrepancy prevails, even in the same diocese, in the demands made upon the people. The priest and his flock are continually coming into collision on pecuniary matters. Twice a year the holy man collects confession money, under the denomination of Christmas and Easter offerings.

He selects in every neighbourhood one or two houses, in which he holds stations of confession. Very disagreeable scenes take place when additional money is demanded, or when additional time for payment is craved. The first thing done when there is a question of marrying a couple is, to make a *bargain* about the marriage money. The wary minister watches the palpitations, puts on a shilling for every sigh, and twopence on every tear, and maddens the impetuosity of the young lovers up to a pound sterling. The remuneration prescribed by the diocesan statutes is never thought of for a moment; the priest makes as hard a bargain as he can, and the bed the poor peasants are to lie upon is sold, to make their concubinage lawful;—but every one present at the marriage is to contribute; —the minister, after begging and entreating some time to little purpose, gets into a violent rage, abuses and is abused;—and in this way is celebrated one of the sacraments of the Catholic Church!—The same scenes of altercation take place when gossip-money is refused at baptisms; but the most painful scenes take place at extreme unction, a ceremony to which the common people in Ireland attach the utmost importance. "Pay me beforehand — this is not enough. I insist upon more, I know you can afford it, I insist upon a larger fee!"—and all this before the dying man, who feels he has not an hour to live! and believes that salvation depends upon the timely application of this sacred grease.

Other bad consequences arise out of the present system of Irish Church support. Many of the clergy are constantly endeavouring to overreach and undermine one another. Every man looks to his own private emolument, regardless of all covenants, expressed or implied. The curate does not make a fair return to the parish priest, nor the parish priest to the curate. There is an universal scramble; every one gets what he can, and seems to think he would be almost justified in appropriating the whole to himself. And how can all this be otherwise? How are the poor wretched clergy to live but by setting a high price on their theological labours, and using every incentive of fear and superstition to extort from six millions of beggars the little payments wanted for the bodies of the poor, and the support of life! I maintain that it is shocking and wicked to leave the religious guides of six millions of people in such a state of destitution! — to bestow no more thought upon them than upon the clergy of the Sandwich Islands! If I were a member of the Cabinet, and met my colleagues once a week to eat birds and beasts, and to talk over the state of the world, I should begin upon Ireland before the soup was finished, go on through fish, turkey, and saddle of mutton, and never end till the last thimbleful of claret had passed down the throat of the incredulous Haddington: but there they sit, week after week; there they come, week after week; the Piccadilly Mars, the Scotch Neptune, Themis Lyndhurst, the Tamworth Baronet, dear Goody, and dearer Gladdy, and think no more of paying the Catholic clergy, than a man of real fashion does of paying his tailor! And there is no excuse for this in fanaticism. There is only one man in the Cabinet who objects from reasons purely fanatical, because the Pope is the Scarlet Lady, or the Seventh Vial, or the Little Horn. All the rest are entirely of opinion that it *ought* to be done—that it is the one thing needful; but they are afraid of bishops, and county meetings, newspapers, and pamphlets, and reviews; all fair enough objects of apprehension, but they must be met, and encountered, and put down. It is impossible that the subject can be much longer avoided, and that every year is to produce a deadly struggle with the people, and a long trial in time of peace with O' somebody, the patriot for the time being, or the general, perhaps, in time of a foreign war.

If I were a Bishop, living beautifully in a state of serene plenitude, I don't think I could endure the thought of so many honest, pious, and laborious clergymen of another faith, placed in such disgraceful circumstances! I

could not get into my carriage with jelly-springs, or see my two courses every day, without remembering the buggy and the bacon of some poor old Catholic Bishop, ten times as laborious, and with much more, perhaps, of theological learning than myself, often distressed for a few pounds! and burthened with duties utterly disproportioned to his age and strength. I think, if the extreme comfort of my own condition did not extinguish all feeling for others, I should sharply commiserate such a Church, and attempt with ardour and perseverance to apply the proper remedy. Now let us bring names and well-known scenes before the English reader, to give him a clearer notion of what passes in Catholic Ireland. The living of St. George's, Hanover Square, is a benefice of about 1500*l.* per annum, and a good house. It is in the possession of Dr. Hodgson, who is also Dean of Carlisle, worth, I believe, about 1500*l.* more. A more comfortable existence can hardly be conceived. Dr. Hodgson is a very worthy, amiable man, and I am very glad he is as rich as he is: but suppose he had no revenues but what he got off his own bat, — suppose that instead of tumbling through the skylight, as his income now does, it was procured by Catholic methods. The Doctor tells Mr. Thompson he will not marry him to Miss Simpson under 30*l.*; Thompson demurs, and endeavours to beat him down. The Doctor sees Miss Simpson; finds her very pretty; thinks Thompson hasty, and after a long and undignified negotiation, the Doctor gets his fee. Soon after this he receives a message from Place, the tailor, to come and anoint him with extreme unction. He repairs to the bed-side, and tells Mr. Place that he will not touch him under a suit of clothes, equal to 10*l.*: the family resist, the altercation goes on before the perishing artisan, the price is reduced to 8*l.*, and Mr. Place is oiled. On the ensuing Sunday the child of Lord B. is to be christened: the godfathers and godmothers will only give a sovereign each: the Doctor refuses to do it for the money, and the church is a scene of clamour and confusion. These are the scenes which, under similar circumstances, *would* take place here, for the congregation want the comforts of religion without fees, and will cheat the clergyman if they can; and the clergyman who means to live, must meet all these artifices with stern resistance. And this is the wretched state of the Irish Roman Catholic clergy! — a miserable blot and stain on the English nation! What a blessing to this country would a real Bishop be! A man who thought it the first duty of Christianity to allay the bad passions of mankind, and to reconcile contending sects with each other. What peace and happiness such a man as the Bishop of London might have conferred on the Empire, if, instead of changing black dresses for white dresses, and administering to the frivolous disputes of foolish zealots, he had laboured to abate the hatred of Protestants for the Roman Catholics, and had dedicated his powerful understanding to promote religious peace in the two countries! Scarcely any Bishop is sufficiently a man of the world to deal with fanatics. The way is not to reason with them, but to ask them to dinner. They are armed against logic and remonstrance, but they are puzzled in a labyrinth of wines, disarmed by facilities and concessions, and, introduced to a new world, come away thinking more of hot and cold, and dry and sweet, than of Newman, Keble, and Pusey. So mouldered away Hannibal's army at Capua! So the primitive and perpendicular prig of Puseyism is softened into practical wisdom, and coaxed into common sense! Providence gives us Generals, and Admirals, and Chancellors of the Exchequer; but I never remember in my time a real Bishop, — a grave elderly man, full of Greek, with sound views of the middle voice and preter-perfect tense, gentle and kind to his poor clergy, of powerful and commanding eloquence; in Parliament never to be put down when the great interests of mankind were concerned; leaning to the Government when *it* was right, leaning to the People when *they* were

right ; feeling that if the Spirit of God had called him to that high office, he was called for no mean purpose, but rather that, seeing clearly, and acting boldly, and intending purely, he might confer lasting benefits upon mankind.

We consider the Irish clergy as factious, and as encouraging the bad anti-British spirit of the people. How can it be otherwise ? They live by the people ; they have nothing to live upon but the voluntary oblations of the people ; and they must fall into the same spirit as the people, or they would be starved to death. No marriage ; no mortuary masses; no unctions to the priest who preached against O'Connell!

Give the clergy a maintenance separate from the will of the people, and you will then enable them to oppose the folly and madness of the people. The objection to the State provision does not really come from the clergy, but from the agitators and repealers : these men see the immense advantage of carrying the clergy with them in their agitation, and of giving the sanction of religion to political hatred; they know that the clergy, moving in the same direction with the people, have an immense influence over them; and they are very wisely afraid, not only of losing this co-operating power, but of seeing it, by a state provision, arrayed against them. I am fully convinced that a State payment to the Catholic clergy, by leaving to that laborious and useful body of men the exercise of their free judgment, would be the severest blow that Irish agitation could receive.

For advancing these opinions, I have no doubt I shall be assailed by Sacerdos, Vindex, Latimer, Vates, Clericus, Aruspex, and be called atheist, deist, democrat, smuggler, poacher, highwayman, Unitarian, and Edinburgh reviewer! Still, *I am in the right*, — and what I say, requires excuse for being trite and obvious, not for being mischievous and paradoxical. I write for three reasons: first, because I really wish to do good; secondly, because if I don't write, I know nobody else will; and thirdly, because it is the nature of the animal to write, and I cannot help it. Still, in looking back I see no reason to repent. What I have said *ought* to be done, generally *has* been done, but always twenty or thirty years too late ; done, not of course because I have said it, but because it was no longer *possible* to avoid doing it. Human beings cling to their delicious tyrannies, and to their exquisite nonsense, like a drunkard to his bottle, and go on till death stares them in the face. The monstrous state of the Catholic Church in Ireland will probably remain till some monstrous ruin threatens the very existence of the Empire, and Lambeth and Fulham are cursed by the affrighted people.

I have always compared the Protestant Church in Ireland (and I believe my friend Thomas Moore stole the simile from me) to the institution of butchers' shops in all the villages of our Indian empire. "We *will* have a butchers' shop in every village, and you, Hindoos, shall pay for it. We know that many of you do not eat meat at all, and that the sight of beef steaks is particularly offensive to you ; but still, a stray European may pass through your village, and want a steak or a chop : the shop *shall* be established ; and you shall pay for it." This is English legislation for Ireland ! ! There is no abuse like it in all Europe, in all Asia, in all the discovered parts of Africa, and in all we have heard of Timbuctoo! It is an error that requires 20,000 armed men for its protection in time of peace ; which costs more than a million a year ; and which, in the first French war, in spite of the puffing and panting of fighting steamers, will and *must* break out into desperate rebellion.

It is commonly said, if the Roman Catholic priests are paid by the State, they will lose their influence over their flocks ; — not their *fair* influence — not that influence which any wise and good man would wish to see in all religions — not the dependence of humble ignorance upon prudence and piety — only fellowship in faction, and fraternity in rebellion ; — all *that* will be lost. A peep-of-day clergyman will no longer preach to a peep-of-day congregation—

a Whiteboy vicar will no longer lead the psalm to Whiteboy vocalists; but everything that is good and wholesome will remain. This, however, is not what the anti-British faction want; they want all the animation which piety can breathe into sedition, and all the fury which the priesthood can preach to diversity of faith: and *this* is what they mean by a clergy losing their influence over the people! The less a clergyman exacts of his people,—the more his payments are kept out of sight, the less will be the friction with which he exercises the functions of his office. A poor Catholic may respect a priest the more who marries, baptizes, and anoints; but he respects him because he associates with his name and character the performance of sacred duties, not because he exacts heavy fees for doing so. Double fees would be a very doubtful cure for scepticism: and though we have often seen the tenth of the earth's produce carted away for the benefit of the clergymen, we do not remember any very lively marks of satisfaction and delight which it produced in the countenance of the decimated person. I am thoroughly convinced that State payments to the Catholic clergy would remove a thousand causes of hatred between the priest and his flock, and would be as favourable to the increase of his useful authority, as it would be fatal to his factious influence over the people.

. . . . . .
. . . . . .
. . . . . .
. . . . . .
. . . . . .
. . . . . .

INDEX.

A.

Abbott, Chief Justice, his opinions on the legality of using spring-guns, i. 324.
Abraham, apologue of, ii. 248.
Absenteeism in Ireland, i. 308; its consequences, 315.
Accomplishments, female, i. 181.
Advertising system of, ii. 99.
Africa, agriculture in, i. 72; refinement among barbarous tribes in, 73; trial by ordeal in, 74; Purra Society in, 74; natives of, in the neighbourhood of Sierra Leone, 71—75; best mode of becoming acquainted with the interior of, 285.
Alarmists in 1802, note on, i. 10.
Alfonso, Lewis's Tragedy of, reviewed, i. 15—17.
Almshouses, likened to church property, ii. 290.
America, United States of; review of Travels in, i. 240—250; of Seybert's work on, 286—292; of Duncan's Travels in, ii. 443—450; their statistics, i. 286—292; cheapness of their government, 241. ii. 43; their religious toleration, 43; their attention to education, 45; cause of their exemption from taxes, 49; their navy, 51.
American debts, Letters on, ii. 326—332.
Americans, their sensitiveness, ii. 46; their curiosity, 48; their fanaticism 51; their dislike of games, 51; their system of slavery denounced, 52.
Amusements, objections to them by the Methodists, i. 98; of the poor, interference with, 136. 140; evangelical objections to them, 148; of the rich, 252—255.
Anabaptists, their missions in India, i. 96—114.
Anastasius, Hope's, review of, i. 316—322.
Angling, description of, i. 135.
Anglomania, Necker and the Encyclopédists charged with, by M. Fievée, i. 36.
Animals, cruelty to, i. 135.
———, *feræ Naturæ*, 251.
Ant-hears, their habits, ii. 79.
Anticatholics, their addresses to the Government, i. 224.
Antiquity, superior wisdom of modern times over, ii. 60.
Arcadian cant described, i. 47.
Archdeacons, their extravagant pay, ii. 259. 291.
Arians, burnt as heretics in 1612, i. 215.
Aristocracy, their habits in reference to the game laws, i. 251; amusements, 252—255 259.
———, French, their probable restoration, i. 24.
Arminians and Calvinists, neutrality of Church of England between, ii. 8.
Army, Turkish, its want of discipline, i. 67; American, 289.
Articles of the Church, relaxation of, i. 101.
Arts and sciences, mankind much happier for discoveries in, i. 183.
Ashantee, review of Bowdich's work on, i. 280—285.
Australia, review of Collins's Account of, i. 27—34.
Authors, one lesson to be drawn from the Deluge by them, i. 151.

B.

Bail, justification of the law of, i. 56.
Bailey, Mr. Justice, his opinion on the legality of using spring-guns, i. 326.
Bakers, fraudulent, custom at Constantinople towards, ii. 114.
Ballot, ii. 305—318; its alleged necessity to prevent intimidation, 305—307; would not put an end to canvassing, 308; its tyranny in compelling a concealment of votes, 308; its tendency to sow universal distrust and exterminate natural leaders, 308; members of Parliament may claim an equal right to it with the electors, 309; a dangerous innovation for a temporary evil, 309; renders scrutiny impossible, 310; takes away all interest in watching the registrations, 310; its effect on petitions, 311; on the communications between the representative and the constituent, 311; its inefficiency for concealment of opinion, 312; leads to deceit and villany, 313; would not prevent the disfranchisement of voters, 314; Randolph's opinion of it, 314; its abolition in Virginia, 314; would disseminate hatred among classes in England, 314; stronger objections to its adoption in Ireland, 314; utterly inefficient against the abuses of power, 315; its operation in America, 315; in clubs, 315; would not prevent bribery, 315; would lead to universal suffrage, 316; would not be accepted without it, 316; picture of a balloto-Grotical family, 316; a mere illusion, 317; folly of regarding it as harmless, 317; or as an experiment, 317.
Baltic Powers, brief picture of their forces, i. 57.
Baltimore, its increase, i. 240.
Bankes, Mr., his Act against buying game, ii. 28.
Bar, the English, its respectability preserved by its inequality of income, ii. 257.
Barbarians, their tendency to form secret societies, i. 74.
Barillon, his testimony as to the English court being in the pay of the French, i. 164; his letters to Louis XIV. referred to, 213—214.
Barlow, Sir George, his conduct at Madras, i. 191—201.
Barristers of six years' standing, the great primum mobile of human affairs, i. 214.

Barrow, his eloquence, i. 5.
Bass's Straits, discovery of, i. 33.
Bathurst, New South Wales, i. 264.
Bear-baiting, proceedings against the practice of, i. 136.
Beggary, encouraged by the Poor-Laws, i. 348.
Bell, Dr., character and saying of, ii. 99.
Benevolence, universal, a principle of ethics, i. 2; Mr. Godwin's principle of, 3; particular and universal, contrasted, 3.
Bengal, missionary proceedings in, i. 106. 120.
Bennet, Hon. H. G., his pamphlet upon New Holland, i. 270.
Bentham, Jeremy, on the promulgation of laws, i. 153; review of his Book of Fallacies, ii. 59—74; his faults and merits, 60; his followers advocate the ballot and new scheme of registration, 310.
Bernstorff, the great minister of Denmark, i. 52.
Bertrandon de la Brocquière, review of his Travels, i. 185—187.
Best, Mr. Justice, on the legality of using spring-guns, i. 327—340. 348.
Bigge, Mr, his report of the colony of New South Wales, ii. 12—24.
Bigotry of the English in reference to Catholic Emancipation, i. 83.
Birds of Brazil, ii. 77.
Bishops, their power of making laws, i. 23; objections to investing them with power to enforce ecclesiastical residence, 48; subjection of the clergy to them, 122; objections to increasing their power, 123; councils to, suggested, 123; their privileges, 124; Catholic, refusal to give the Crown a veto upon their nomination, 224; persecuting, 367. ii. 12; their duties not enforced, 259; the law never suspects, 260; their nepotism, 262; their injustice, 267; illustration of their bestowal of patronage, 263, 264. 270; their differences in doctrinal requirements 263; their impeccability, 266. 270, 271. 286. 288; their inquisitive practices, 266. 270. 297; their promotion, 265; their power over the clergy, 271, 272. 297, 298; their taking oaths by proxy, 335; "Their Saturday Night," 284; their repentance, 286; their duty to the Church, 295; their incomes, as compared with deans and canons, 300; Catholic contrasted with Protestant, 339.
Blair, Dr., his merits, i. 5.
Bligh, Governor, his appointment to New South Wales, i. 266.
Blomfield, Bishop. *See* London, Bishop of.
Books, improvement in their publication, i. 228.
Bore, description of the, ii. 88.
Boroughmongers, their unfair influence, ii. 216; their peculiar position, 221.
Boroughs, rotten, the alleged cause of our wealth and power, ii. 209; plea for compensation on their disfranchisement, 211; objection to them, 217.
Botany Bay, objections to it as a penal settlement, i. 28; review of works upon, 260—272., ii. 12—24.
Bourbons, a weak race, ii. 202.
Bourne, Mr. Sturges, eulogium on, i. 296., ii. 154.
Bowdich, Mr., review of his work on Ashantee, i. 280—285.
Bowles, John, review of his Reflections at the Conclusion of the War, i. 10—12.
Bradbury, Mr., review of his Travels in America, i. 240—250.
Brahmans, their opposition to the missionaries, i. 114.
Bravery of medical men, i. 66.
Brawn, process of making, i. 136.
Brazil, the birds of, ii. 77.
Brehon law of property in Ireland, i. 82.
Bristol, sermon preached before the Mayor of, ii. 242—248; ruin and alarm occasioned by the mob at, 307; cathedral of, an instance of the benefits of prebendary estates, 376.
British people. *See* English.
Broadhurst, Thomas, his work on Female Education reviewed, i. 175—186.
Brougham, Lord, ii. 217. 281.
Broughton's Letters from a Mahratta Camp reviewed, i. 225—228.
Brown, Mr. Isaac Hawkins, ii. 147.
Bulls, Irish, review of Edgeworth's Essay on, i. 69—71; pleasure arising from, compared with that arising from wit, 69; one source of the pleasure experienced from them, 70.
Buonaparte, apprehensions entertained of, i. 10. 26; his conduct to Madame de Staël, 44; his massacre and poisoning at Jaffa, 64—66; his threats and intentions, ii. 146; his toleration, 151. 153; his government, 156. 164.
Bury jail, i. 335.
Bussy, notice of, i. 38.
Buxton, Mr., his efforts for the improvement of prisons, ii. 330; his book on prisons, 337. *note.*

C.

Calvinism, supported by the early reformers, ii. 5; and by the articles of the Irish Church, 5; does not disqualify for preferment in the Church of England, 6; neutrality of the Church on the doctrines of, 8.
Calvinists in Denmark, i. 61.
Campanero, account of the, ii. 77.
Canada, its injudicious treatment by England, ii. 44.
Canal, Holstein, advantages of, i. 68.
Candia, situation of the king of, i. 38. 41.
Canning, George, a frivolous jester, ii. 142.
Cant, Arcadian, described, i. 47.
Canterbury, Archbishop of, his exorbitant income, ii. 257. 323. 290. 300; his consecration oath, 258. 280; his practice of *option* on the consecration of a bishop, 263; loan for the improvement of his palace, 271; his high character, 273; his first feelings on the proposed innovation upon cathedrals, 290.
Cape Coast Castle, description of, i. 279.
Capital punishment, necessity of, i. 152.
Capital punishments in Denmark, i. 152.
Cashel, Archbishop of, notice of his charge in favour of the Catholics, ii. 121.
Caste in India, system of, i. 116, 117; consequences of loss of, 107.
Castes, institution of, the curb of ambition, i. 143.
Castlereagh, Lord, i. 315.
Cathedrals, injustice of conferring the patronage of upon bishops, ii. 260. 263. 265. 272. 285. 288; benefits of the preferments of, 275—277; management of the estates of, 276; four prebends to each insufficient, 277. 292; folly of sacrificing the Crown patronage in, 278; danger from the committee of, 279; opportunity of improvement opened by the Chapters of, 281; treatment of, by the Commission, 281. 288, 289; clergy of, compared with parochial clergy, 288.
Catholic Church of Ireland, its revenue, ii. 334; its places of worship contrasted with the Protestant, 334; payment of the priests, 335, 336; no chance of its being converted, 336; injustice of its position, 337; sum required to pay its priesthood, 338; a state

payment to it would be the heaviest blow to agitation, 342.
Catholics, their emancipation, i. 9; review of Parnell's History of the Penal Laws against them, 127—131; Dissenters' opposition to their emancipation, 207. 224; persecution how exercised against them, 219; unreasonable apprehensions entertained from their emancipation, 220. *et seq.*; statement of their disabilities, 305., ii. 169; their proportion to Protestants, i. 306. 306; their early marriages, 306; their rooted antipathy to England, 308. 310; their superstition, 314; meritorious patronage of, by the Whigs, 315; question of their emancipation will perhaps be settled by the navies of France and America, 51; never be settled but from fear, 58; notice of Archbishop of Cashel's charge in favour of their claims, 120; their earnestness in the cause of emancipation, 130; their alliance with the democratic party, 127; review of Lord Nugent's statement in their support, 120—128; imputation on them by University of Oxford, 154; their divided allegiance, 130. 234; discrepancies of opinion in their church, 132; small diversity from, in many Protestant sects, 133; advice to, 134; delusions respecting the power and influence of the Pope over them, 135; their persecutions compared with those of Protestants, 138; their alleged want of regard to an oath, 139; easy to obtain the nomination of their dignitaries. 140; date of their exclusion from the Irish House of Commons, 148; treatment of, by Mr. Perceval, 151; Catholics not opposed to liberty, 155; *indulgences* granted them, 157; their increase of wealth, 172; proposal for payment of their clergy, 173, 174; no hope for their emancipation if the peace of Europe be restored, 185; alleged unchangeableness of their religion, 198. *et seq.*; progress of arguments used against them, 203. 226; oath prescribed to them in 1793, 224; complaints of their importunity, 229. 231; precedents in their favour, 232; policy to be pursued towards them, 233; their intolerance, 234; causes of the clamour against them, 235. *See also* Emancipation, Catholic.
Catteau, review of his Tableau des Etats Danois, i. 50. 63.
Caucus in America, i. 239.
Cayenne, the forest of, ii. 78.
Census in Denmark, i. 58.
Ceylon, review of Percival's account of, i. 37—44; snakes of, 44; leeches of, 44; cocoa-nut tree of, 44; talipot tree of, 44; success of the missionaries in, 117.
Chancery, one of the great uncorrected evils of the country, i. 243; Court of, compared to a boa constrictor, ii. 80.
Changes, modern, Letterson, ii. 332.
Character of—Dr. Bell, ii. 98; Lord Brougham, i 247; the Archbishop of Canterbury, ii. 273; Lord Eldon, 191: Earl Grey, 218. 221; Mr. Grote, 309; Lord Hawkesbury, 149. *et seq.*; Francis Horner, 319; the Bishop of London, 297; Sir James Mackintosh, 302—305; Lord Melbourne, 278. 281; Gen. Monk, 306; Dr. Parr, i. 4; Rt. Hon. Spencer Perceval, ii. 142; William IV., 212, 222; Lord John Russell, 286. 301; the Bishop of Gloucester, 295, 296. *note.*
Character of the English in matters of charity, i. 355.
Charitable institutions, M. Turgot's objections to, combated, i. 3.
Charles I., conduct of Cromwell to, i. 209; remarks on his execution, 159.
Chartism, formed by the Poor Laws, i. 295.
Children, natural, in Denmark, i. 57.
Chimney-sweepers, i. 272—279; their miseries, 273, 274; their peculiar diseases, 274; their peculiar dangers, 275; their inhuman treatment, 277, 278.
Christian Charity, Sermon on the rules of, ii. 8. 15.
Christian Observer, reprobation of the, i. 121.
Christianity, the greatest ornament and greatest blessing, i. 77; difficulty attending its progress in the East, 108; its introduction into India, 142.
Chronology among the Greenlanders dated from their conversion to Christianity, i. 61.
Church of England (the), state of endowment in, i. 49; how affected by Lancaster's system of education, 75; relaxation of its articles, 101; privileges of Dissenters over its members, 101; its income, 122; its disadvantages as compared with dissent, 203. 206., ii. 257. 293; hardship and injustice caused by, in Ireland, 178. 186; a gregarious profession, 237; charity and wisdom of its policy, 241; its neutrality between Arminians and Calvinists, 242; its pacific spirit, 243; right mode of defending it, 193; encomium on, 230; improvements in it, 252; its respectability preserved by the unequal division of its revenues, 257. 282. 292. 300; unjust reasoning of laymen concerning it, 257. 290; evil of extinguishing its Cathedral preferments, 276. 279; its emoluments open to the lowest ranks, 276; inexpediency of lessening its power, 279. 290; treatment of, by the Whig government, 284; by Lord John Russell, 286; by the public, 289. 301; fatal consequences to, should the government measures pass into law, 297. 300; its improvement as an institution, 300.
Church establishment, its nature and object ii. 137; real danger to, in Ireland, 140; circumscription of, 275.
Church establishments, their fatal disease, i. 205.
Church-rates, argument in support of, ii. 54; ministerial error about, 73.
Cingalese, notice of the, i. 40.
Cinnamon wood, remarks on, i. 43.
Civilisation, on what it depends, ii. 43, 44.
Clapham, patent Christians of, ii. 147.
Clarence, Duke of, expectations from him, ii. 129.
Classical learning, its abuse in England, i. 167. 174.
Classification of patients in lunatic asylums, i. 231; of prisoners, 332.
Clergy, English, their want of eloquence, i. 5; parochial, unrepresented in Parliament, 23; evangelical, notice of, 88; their education, 101; their subjection to the bishops, 122; residence of, may be too hardly exacted, 127; Orthodox, Methodists' war against, 140; in Ireland allowed to have private prisons, ii. 55; their difficult position, 57; unfairly treated by ministers, 269. 271. 281; by the bishops, 271. 272. 281; how affected by the Plurality and Residence Bill, 287. 298; by the Dean and Chapter Bill, 292; picture of a poor member, 294; of cathedrals compared with parochial clergy, 288; speech at the meeting of, at Cleveland, 197. 201; at Beverley, 201. 207; remarks on their political meetings, 200, 201.
Cleveland, speech at, on the Catholic Question, ii. 154. 201.
Climate of New South Wales, i. 260.
Climbing-boys, Society for superseding the Necessity for, its proceedings, i. 272—279.

Clive, his genius, i. 37.
Clubs, operation of the ballot in voting at, ii. 313.
Coal, want of, in Ireland, i. 315.
Cocoa-nut tree of Ceylon, i. 44.
Cœlebs in Search of a Wife, review of, i. 145—149.
Collings, Lieut-Col., review of his Account of New South Wales, i. 26—34.
Colonial secretaries, excuse for their misconduct, i. 260.
Colonies, English, folly of keeping up some of them, i. 289; Danish, 60.
Colony of—New Holland, i. 28—30; New South Wales, 26—34., ii. 143; Norfolk Island, 31. 33.
Colquhoun, Mr., his Police of the Metropolis, i. 48.
Combination, danger of the practice of, i. 133.
Commerce of—America, i. 287; Denmark, 60.
Commission, Ecclesiastical. *See* Ecclesiastical Commission.
Common informer likened to the honeybird, i. 44.
Compensation for abolishing slavery, ii. 261.
Concessions, forced, their danger, ii. 132.
Conciliation, tribunal of, in Denmark, i. 55.
Congress, payment to members of, i. 290.
Conquerors, benefits derived from them, i. 286.
Conquest, its advantages to science, i. 39.
Conscience, plea of, in a monarch, ii. 152.
Consolation, political, fallacy of, ii. 68.
Constantinople, custom at, towards fraudulent bakers, ii. 114.
Constitution in France, i. 18; in England, 21. 23.
Continent (the), improvement in the prisons of, i. 361.
Conversation, the pleasures of, i. 183.
Conversion, duty of, in India questionable, i. 118.
Convicts, their morals and condition at Botany Bay, i. 272, 272; Rev. Mr. Marsden's bearing towards them, ii. 16.
Coomassie, description of, i. 96.
Corn, combinations to raise the price of, i. 14.
Corn Law Bill of 1825, ii. 207.
Cornwall, Duke of, prayer for, ii. 254.
Coronation oath, its binding nature, ii. 63; royal scruples upon it, 152.
Corporal punishments in prisons, i. 361.
Corporation and Test Acts, ii. 152; their spirit contrasted with religious toleration in Denmark, i. 7.
Costume, unimportance of, in administering justice, i. 243.
Cotton-spinners, their activity and enterprise, ii. 203.
Counsel, Lord Lovat's appeal to be allowed, ii. 112; Lord Stafford's conviction from want of, 119.
Counsel for prisoners, review of Stockton's work on allowing, ii. 106. 119; cruelty of denying, i. 362—364; judges not to be trusted as, 364; petition of jurymen for allowing, ii. 106; authorities in favour of the practice, 110; probable effect of allowing, 116; absurdity of allowing judges as, 110. 113.
Credit, despotism opposed to, i. 26.
Crocodile, Waterton's adventures with a, ii. 83.
Cromwell, his conduct towards Charles I., i. 209; his conduct in Ireland, ii. 55.
Cromwell, Henry, his conduct in Ireland, ii. 241.
Cruelty to animals, i. 135.
Curates, their hard position ii. 8, 9. 11; their helpless situation, 271; their expectations, 276; how affected by the Plurality and Residence Bill, 288. 298; Salary Bill, review of, i. 121—127; lay curates, 127.
Curwen's Observations on Ireland, i. 304.
Customs, greater expense of collecting in England than in America, i. 288; dues exacted on Waterton's collection, ii. 83.

D.

Danes, their character, i. 62; no literati among them, 63; robbery of their fleet by England, ii. 160.
Darwin, Dr., on the law of nature, i. 42.
Davison, Mr., his considerations on the Poor-Laws, i. 300; his style, 302.
Death, punishment of, ii. 42.
Debt, Danish, i. 58; American, 291.
Delphine, De Staël's review of, i. 44—48.
Demerara, animals of, ii. 75; Indian tribes in, 75; poisons used in, 77.
Denmark, review of Catteau's Tableau of, i. 50—63; founder of its monarchy, 51; Bernstoff, its great minister, 51; revolution of, 53—56; mildness of its government, 54; Protestant nunneries in, 54. 55; its tribunals of conciliation, 55; its cheap justice 55; slavery in, 56; its general statistics, 56—59; its religious toleration, 61; its colonies, 60; its universities, 61; conduct of the English Government in taking the fleet of, 319.
D'Epinay, Madame, review of her Mémoires et Correspondance, i. 234—239.
Derwent, description of its port, i. 260.
Despotism opposed to credit. i. 26.
De Staël, Madame. *See* Staël, Madame de.
Diderot, his dislike of Rosseau, i. 237.
Diet of prisoners, i. 332. 360.
Dinner, a triumph of civilised life, i. 272.
Discipline of prisons may be over estimated, ii. 40.
Discourses on Various Subjects, by Dr. Rennel, review of, i. 5. 9.
Discovery, who entitled to the merit of, ii. 318.
Discretionary power in the administration of laws, arguments against, i. 48.
Disfranchisement of the Irish voters, ii. 211; of rotten boroughs, 212; right of, must reside somewhere, 211.
Dissent, disadvantages of the Church compared with, i. 121. 203. 206.
Dissent and Methodism, review of Mr. Ingram's book on the Causes of their Increase, i. 87—101.
Dissenters, their privileges over members of the Church, i. 121; charges of Jacobinism against, 88; exploded clamours against, 88; Lord Sidmouth's intentions towards, 201—205; their treatment, ii. 43. 150. 152. 177; dangers from, to the Church, 206; their conduct in reference to the Catholic claims, 124; style of preaching among, 124; their inexpensiveness to the state, 129; wide difference of their opinions, 130. 132.
Dissenters' Marriage Bill, opposition to, ii. 43.
Dissenting ministers, want of wealth among, ii. 129.
Distilleries in America, i. 288; prohibited in New South Wales, 268; their value in New South Wales, ii. 253.
Distrust, political fallacy of, ii. 67.
Disturbances at Madras, i. 192—201.
Dordrecht, anecdote of the conduct of the clergy at, ii. 268.
Dotation of women in New South Wales, i. 263.

Doyle, Dr., the Pope of Ireland, ii. 131.
Dress, common error about female, i. 148.
Dublin, Whitelaw's History of, i. 304.
Duelling, a civilised institution among a barbarous people, i. 30.
Duncan, Mr. John, review of his Travels in the United States, ii. 42. 51.
Dundas, the tyrant of Scotland, ii. 319.
Dupleix, notice of, i. 38.
Dutchman, Ceylonese, his character, i. 39.
Duties levied in New South Wales, i. 267.

E.

Ecclesiastical Commission, its constitution, ii. 255. 261. 265. 269. 281. 291; has done too much, 256. 259. 263. 273. 275. 295; encourages the enemies of the Church, 257. 269. 272. 284; its love of patronage, 259; its injustice, 259. 262. 264. 265. 267. 272. 274. 281. 291; omission in its report of the options of the sees of Canterbury and York, 263; its frequent changes of policy, 267; how it has been worked, 281; rapidity of its proceedings, 268; its original plan of taxation, 281; its injustice to St. Paul's, 267, 268. 299; its confiscations, illustration of, in the proceedings of the clergy at Dordrecht, 268; treatment of by Lord J. Russell, 283. 299.
Economy, American, an object for our imitation, ii. 43.
Edgeworth, on Bulls, review of, i. 69—71; on Professional Education, review of, 166—174.
Edmonton, history of the ecclesiastical division of, 266. 294.
Education, review of Mrs. Trimmer's book on Lancaster's plan of, i. 75—80.
Education, defects in, i. 6; Professional, review of Edgeworth's work on, 166—174; Female, review of Broadhurst's work on, 174—185; system of, in public schools, 186—191; use of ridicule in, 78; of the clergy, 101; of the poor, 101; too much Latin and Greek in, 167—173; defective system of, at the English universities, 172—174; Hamiltonian system of, ii. 317; combined with that of Lancaster, 320; unnecessary difficulties created in, 321, 322; foolish saying of Dr. Bell upon, 321; the anomaly in, as regards religion, 147; of the people, duty of, 250; attention to, in America, 46.
Egede, John, a Norwegian priest, converts the Greenlanders to Christianity, i. 61.
Eldon, Lord, his character, ii. 217.
Elections, political, modes of, i. 18—20; disgusting scenes at, ii. 215. 219.
Elizabeth, Queen, her conduct towards Ireland, i. 83; statute of, relating to the poor, 303; persecutions by, ii. 237.
Eloquence, neglect of, in British education, i. 6.
Emancipation, Catholic, bigotry of the English in reference to it, i. 83; once deemed hopeless, 128; relaxation in seeking it not justifiable, 128; madness of opposing it, 80. 83, 84. 131; review of the question, ii. 120. 134; must be ultimately carried, 121. 229; view history will take of the question, 123; speech at Cleveland on, 197—201; letter to the electors on, 223. 241; its probable effect, 175. *See also* Catholics.
Emigration to Botany Bay, advantages offered for, i. 272; to America, 250.
Emulation, absurdity of banishing it from schools, ii. 321.
Emu, description of, i. 260.
Encomium on—the Church of England, ii. 230; the Whigs, 207; Charles James Fox, i. 149; Hope's Anastasius, 317. 322; Sir James Scarlett, 353; the Society for Improving Prison Discipline, 353. 361; Sir Robert Peel, ii. 106; Mr. Sturges Bourne, 154; Earl Grey, 220; Lord John Russell, 301.
Encyclopédists, M. Fievée's charge of Anglomania against them, i. 37.
Endowment, state of, in the English Church, i. 49.
England, the condition of Ireland a reproach to her, i. 304., ii. 52; likened to Turkey, 316; uncertain basis of her prosperity, ii. 123; extravagance of her government, 123; her inconsistent humanity, 126; democratic party in, 127; her danger from Irish disconten', 134; her state previous to the Reform Bill, 217; considers poverty infamous, 258; has made an enormous revolution within ten years, 310; wants a little breathing time, 311; equal division of parties in, 307; happiness enjoyed in, 318; danger of anarchy in, 318; envy and ill-will of the Americans on account of her superior civilization, 329; her past injustice towards Ireland, 335; the best statutes for her have been made since the Union, 336.
English, their prejudices, i. 6; their reserve, 35; M. Fievée's charges against them, 36; their character in matters of charity, 121; their character, 176., ii. 210; improvement among, 215; their love of labour, 97; their conduct during the revolutionary war, 143, 144; their unacquaintance with war, 153; their feelings towards Dissenters, 154; their bigotry towards the Irish, 15. 167; their excessive loyalty towards the king, 176; their prejudices regarding Catholics, 181; their excellent but misdirected spirit, 182; causes of their stability, 188, 189.
English Church. *See* Church of England *and* Ecclesiastical Commission.
Epinay, Madame d', review of her Mémoires et Correspondance, i. 234. 239.
Episcopacy, exclusion of, from the Upper House, i. 23.
"Erin go bragh!" suggestion for a better anthem, ii. 335.
Establishments, i. 205.
Eulogomania of Dr. Parr, i. 4.
Evangelical Clergy, notice of, i. 88.
Evangelicals, their proceedings in the East, i. 113; their anticipated proceedings, ii. 298.
Execution of — Strafford, i. 159; Charles I., 160; Lewis XVI., 160.
Exercise, athletic, in public schools, its unimportance, i. 187.
Expenditure in the United States, i. 290; evil effects of a large, 291.

F.

Fagging, system of, i. 186, 187.
Fairs, their effect in filling prisons, i. 366.
Fallacies, review of Bentham's Book of, ii. 59—74.
Fallacy of—self-trumpeting, ii. 65; imputations as an answer to expedient measures, 66; political distrust, 67; the cry against innovation, 67; political consolation, 68; the argument of Procrastinator, 69; the quietist, 69; generalities in political argument, 70; the imputation of theory, 71.
False quantities, i. 46.
Fanaticism, its cause in all ages, i. 99; mistaken for religion, ii. 252.

Fanatics, right way of dealing with them, ii. 340.
Farmers, unjust charges upon them, i. 14; how affected by the game laws, i. 253.
Fear, difference between personal and political, ii. 211. 214.
Fearon, Mr., review of his Journey in America, i. 240. 250.
Female dress, common error about, i. 1. 48.
Female Education, review of Broadhurst's work on, i. 174—185.
Ferocity, the natural weapon of the common people, i. 329.
Fiction, danger of varnishing characters in works of, i. 47.
Fievée, J., review of his Lettres sur l'Angleterre, i. 34—37; his approach to pessimism, 36; his charges against the English, 36; his charge of Anglomania against the Encyclopédists, 37.
Finance, Necker's Observations on, reviewed, i. 26. *See also* Taxes.
Fishery, pearl, account of, i. 42.
Foolahs, progress among, i. 73.
Foolometer, use of a, ii. 285.
Fops, clerical, illustration of, i. 9.
Forests of Cayenne, ii. 78.
Fox, Charles James, review of Dr. Parr's "Characters" of, i. 149. 153; review of his historical work, 154—166; review of Heywood's Vindication of his History, 207—218; anecdote of, ii. 285.
Fragment on the Irish Roman Catholic Church, ii. 333. 342.
France, versatility of public opinion in, i. 24; its power, 17; price of revolutionary lands in, 24; its difficulties, 25; apprehensions of its power, ii. 136. 140. 143, 144. 151. 153. 157. 160.
French aristocracy, its probable restoration, i. 24.
French revolution emulates the English revolution, i. 160.
Fry, Mrs., and her friends, exaggeration of their efforts, i. 355-367., ii. 21.
Furniture, tax on, in America, i. 288.

G.

Galileo, his saying on the loss of his sight, ii. 321.
Gamble's Travels in Ireland, i. 304.
Game, Mr. Bankes's Act against buying, ii. 28; sale of, i. 252. 255—259; advantages of legalising the sale of, ii. 31, 32.
Game Laws, i. 250. 259; review of the Hon. and Rev. W. Herbert's Letter on, ii. 25; their scandal and disgrace, i. 354., ii. 15. 32; their amendment recommended, i. 322; futility of severe laws against them, 322. 330. 345—348; review of report of the House of Commons on, 348., ii. 42; one fourth of commitments, for offences against them, 30; absence of, in America, 44; reform of, 78; cruelties of, 217.
Gaming, extract from Dr. Rennel's Sermon on, i. 6.
Gazi Hassan, notice of, i. 68.
Genealogy of nations, embarrassing circumstances in the speculations, concerning it, i. 30.
Generalities, fallacy of dealing in, in political argument, ii. 70.
George III., protects Joseph Lancaster against the Church, i. 75. *note.*
George IV., his speech to the Hanoverians, ii. 207.
Ghosts, belief in, has left the drawing-room for the kitchen, ii. 123.
Gibraltar, a useless and extravagant possession. i. 289.
Glory, consequences of the national love of, i. 291.
Gloucester, Bishop of, his attack on the author, ii. 295; his character, 296.
Government, rights of, i. 11; no other ultimatum in, than perfect justice, 128; what the first object should be, ii. 30; constitutional, 65; absolute, 68; kingly, origin of, 79; has nothing to do with theological errors, 136; cannot be carried on without patronage, 278; its conduct to the Church, 278; English, its extreme timidity and consequent violence, i. 239; its extravagance, ii. 123; its cheapness in America, i. 241; its mildness in Denmark, 54.
Governments, effects of the moral sense on, i. 11.
Godly and ungodly, dangerous division of mankind into, i. 101.
Godwin, Mr., his principle of universal benevolence, i. 3; refuted by Malthus, 8.
Grammar should be taught after some knowledge of a language is obtained, ii. 105.
Granby, review of, ii. 84—92.
Grand Vizier, instances of his ignorance, i. 68.
Grattan, his character, i. 316; his sense and moderation, ii. 230; his want of habits of business, 303.
Greatness of mind, common notion of, i. 47.
Greek, importance attached to, in English education, i. 170. *See also* Latin.
Green General Duff, reply to his letter to the Morning Chronicle, ii. 330.
Greenland, its inhabitants converted to Christianity by John Egede, a Norwegian priest, i. 61; its chronology dated from its conversion to Christianity, 61.
Grey, Earl, his character, ii. 218—221.
Grote, Mr., his dagger ballot-box, ii. 305; its effect if adopted, 308. 317; his character and political conduct, 309; his expectation of the effect of the ballot upon landlords, 311.
Guiana, trees of, ii. 74.
Guldberg, Ove, notice of, i. 51.
Gunpowder Plot, sermon on the anniversary of, ii. 242—249.
Gurney, Mr., on Prisons, i. 336.

H.

Habeas Corpus Act, its suspension, i. 239.
Habits of the — honeybird, i. 44; musk-rat, 44; kangaroo, 261; ornithorhynchus, 261; the snake, ii. 77. 82; the campanero, 77; the toucan, 78; the sloth, 79; the ant-bear, 79; the vampire, 80; the tortoise, 80; the vulture, 79. 82.
Hall, Lieut., review of his Travels in America, i. 239—250.
Hamilton's method of teaching languages, ii. 317—327; its errors, 321; testimony to its efficiency, 325.
Hanging, curious circumstance relating to the punishment of, i. 57.
Hanoverians, speech of George IV. to the, ii. 207.
Harmonites in America, ii. 51.
Hatchard, Mr., persons meeting at his shop, i. 186.
Hawkesbury, Lord, his character, ii. 148. 156. 161. 171.
Hayti, boast of the Emperor of, regarding punishment, ii. 7.

Headlam, John, review of his Letter on Prison Labour, ii. 35—41. 45.
Heathen, societies for converting the, i. 106.
Heligoland, notice of, i. 62.
Helots, the Irish Catholics treated as, i. 304.
Henry VIII., persecutions by, ii. 237.
Herbert, Hon. and Rev. William, review of his Letter on the Game Laws, ii. 25.
Heresy, treatment of, i. 202.
Heretics, Arians burnt as, in 1612, i. 215.
Herrnhuters, or Northern Quakers, i. 61.
Heroism of Dr. Wittman, i. 66.
Heywood, Samuel, review of his Vindication of Fox's History, i. 207—218.
Hindoo faith, the Musulmans of India not converts from it, i. 117.
Hindoos, anecdote of their feelings relative to caste, i. 117; their religion, 117—119; their persecution by Tippoo, 144.
Historical Apology for the Irish Catholics, Parnell's review of, i. 80—84.
Hodgson, Adam, review of his Letters from North America, ii. 42—52.
Holford, George, review of his work on Prisons i. 337.
Holstein, exportation of horses from, i. 51; its soil, 53; canal, advantages of its, 60.
Homer, morality of, i. 8.
Honeybird, its habits, i. 44; common informer likened to, 44.
Hope, Mr., eulogium on his Anastasius, i. 316. 322.
Horner Francis, his character, ii. 318—321.
Horner Leonard, Letter to, ii. 318.
Horses, exportation of, from Holstein, i. 51.
House of Commons, expectations from, when reformed, ii. 211.
House of Lords, suggestions regarding it, i. 23; likened to Mrs. Partington, ii. 214.
Human Nature, experiment upon it in New South Wales, i. 28.
Humane Society, review of Dr. Langford's Anniversary Sermon for it, i. 12.
Humanity, on the ridicule cast upon, i. 278; its operation, under the Poor Laws, 299.
Hume, David, anecdote of, at Paris, i. 238.
Hume, Sir P., review of Lady Murray's Narrative of the Adventures of, i. 154—166.
Hungary, parallel with Ireland, ii. 177.
Hunting description of, i. 135.
Huskisson, Mr., ii. 170.

I.

India, our empire in, i. 37; missions in, 102—121; consequences of the loss of caste in, 107; difficulty attending the progress of Christianity in, 108; proceedings of the evangelical party in, 114; Mahometans of, not converts from Hindooism, 117; duty of conversion in, questionable, 117—119; introduction of Christianity into, 142; difference of officers serving in, from those on European service, 192.
Impropriators, lay, i. 125.
Imputations, fallacy of, as an answer to expedient measures, ii. 66.
Informers, odious nature of their trade, i. 131; deterred by public indignation, ii. 30.
Ingram, Mr., review of his Causes of the Increase of Methodism and Dissent, i. 87—102.
Innovation, source of the dislike of, i. 331; fallacy of the cry against, ii. 67.
Insanity caused by Methodism, i. 99; Quaker treatment of it. 228—234; no dependence on medicine for its cure, 232; curious case of, 233.
Insects the curse of tropical climates, ii. 81.
Inspectors of prisons, i. 338.
Institutions, good, are indispensable, ii. 65; must be defensible, 222; number marked for destruction in 1837, 279; much easier to destroy when associated with mean ideas, 285.
Instruction, religious, in early life should be confined to general principles, i. 79.
Interference of Providence, instances of, cited by Methodists, i. 89. *et seq.*
Intimidation of tenants by their landlords, and of shopkeepers by their customers, ii. 174; not confined to the aristocracy, 307; ballot would afford no protection against it, 312.
Intolerance, its lasting spirit, i. 203; Methodists' complaint of, 303.
Inundation in Denmark, i. 53.
Ireland, her conduct in the American war, ii. 141. 230; our proper policy towards her, 145; her forfeited lands, 146; danger of tyrannising over her, 147. 202; opposition to the Union in, 149; nearly lost during the American war, 149; conduct of England towards, 150; anticipated conduct of France towards her, 157; a mill-stone about the neck of England, 159; concealment of arms in, 163; probable invasion of, 163; exploits of the invading force in 1796, 164; her statistics, 166; practical evils in, 170; parallel with Hungary, 177; premium offered to invade her, 202; payment of the clergy in, 205. 228; fruits of English government in, 206; anticipated effects of emancipation in, 206; Inquisition never existed in, 226; review of Parnell's Survey of the History of, i. 80—84; never subdued till the reign of Elizabeth, 83; conduct of Elizabeth towards, 83; Brehon law of property in, 82; review of the state of, 304—316; remedies for, 315; operation of tithes in, 306, 307; tithes must be relaxed in, ii. 151. 174; Gamble's Travels in, 171; folly and rapacity of the landlords of, 182; bigotry and party spirit of the Protestants of, 176; absenteeism in, 180; middlemen the standing grievance of, 181. 186; injustice of the English Church in, 178. 184. 187; potatoes one cause of her wretched condition, 184; misgovernment of, 176. 185; difficulty of executing the laws in, 104; want of coal in, 185; picture of ploughing in, 185; her demoralised peasantry, 200; baseness of her treatment by England, 283; expenses of the wars in, 286; Catholic disabilities in, 286; Protestant Church in, 288; Cromwell's conduct in, 286; natives of, in America, 308; quiet of, under Queen Anne, 130; Dr. Doyle the Pope of, 131; power of the priests in, 134. 136; power of the government to obtain the nomination of the Catholic dignitaries in, 140; Orangemen of, 147. 168; disfranchisement of voters in, 211; prevented only by Grattan from separating from England, 230; increase in her wealth and power, 233; forfeited estates in, 234; conduct of Henry Cromwell in, 241; injustice to her in the present state of the Catholic Church, 337.
Irish in America, ii. 83.
Irreligion, stigma of the charge of, i. 78.

J.

Jacobinism condemned, i. 11; charged against Dissenters, 188; detestable, ii. 176.
Jaffa, massacre and poisoning at, i. 64, 65.
James II., Fox's view of his conduct in regard to the Catholic religion, i. 213—215; con-

troversy between Mr. Fox and Mr. Rose respecting his conduct, 163.
Janissaries. their original constitution, i. 67.
Jephson, Mr. and Mrs., mention of, i. 234. *note.*
Jersey, reason why smuggling could not be suppressed in, ii. 219.
Jews prohibited from entering Norway, i. 61. *note;* equality of their treatment in America, ii. 43.
Johnson's Shooter's Guide, i. 322.
Joinville, Prince, ii. 337.
Judges, their removability under Charles I. and II., i. 162; policy of the law towards, as compared with bishops, ii. 260; idiosyncrasies of, 117; differences among, 118; inadequate number of, 118; that smite contrary to law, 183—189; jealousy with which juries should watch them, i. 239; not to be trusted as counsel for prisoners, 363; absurdity of considering them as counsel for prisoners, ii. 110. 114.
Juries, jealousy with which they should watch judges, i. 239.
Jurisprudence of a country not to be learned merely by perusing its statutes, i. 89.
Juryman, obstinacy in a, ii. 209.
Justice, importance of the tribunal of, ii. 185—189; how best promoted, 192; value of the impression of, i. 256; its cheapness in Denmark, i. 55; in America, ii. 48.
Justices. *See* Magistrates.
Jutland, description of, i. 52.

K.

Kangaroo, described, i. 261.
"Kimes," Mr. Styles's blunder about, i. 141.
King, his supremacy merely nominal, i. 260.
Knowledge, importance communicated to old age by, i. 184; its alleged disadvantages in women, 177—185.
Knox, Robert, his account of Ceylon, i. 38.

L.

Labour, objections to a fixed rate of, i. 32, 33; compulsory, of prisoners before trial, ii. 32; rates of, in New South Wales, i. 266.
Lancaster, Joseph, review of Mrs. Trimmer's book on his New Plan of Education, i. 75—80; protected by George III. against the Church, 75; rewards and punishments in his institution, 78; order displayed in his school astonishing, 79; his system may be combined with that of Hamilton, ii. 95.
Land, property of every man in the game upon his, i. 252.
Landlords Irish, their folly and rapacity, i. 311.
Langford, Dr., review of his Anniversary Sermon for the Humane Society, i. 12.
Laplanders, remark on their condition, i. 63.
Latin and Greek, too much of them in English education, i. 167—173; Hamilton's method of teaching, ii. 92—106.
Law, want of reform in its processes, i. 243.
Lawrence, General, notice of, i. 38.
Laws, on the promulgation of, i. 153; obsoleteness of many, ii. 124; their proper execution must depend upon public opinion, 106; difficulties of obtaining any improvement in them, 109; boasted lenity of the English, i. 362—364; their operation in civil cases, 243; their caprice in disallowing counsel to prisoners, 244; fallacy of declaring them irrevocable, ii. 62; their continuity by oath, 63, 64; folly of holding any to be unalterable, 148; great improvement in the English, 207; requisites for making those of England deserving the eulogium they obtain, 119; difficult execution of, in Ireland, i. 313; for the preservation of game, not favourable to the morals of the poor, 252.
Lawyer that tempted Christ, ii. 189—196.
Learning, classical, its abuse in England, ii. 37—45.
Leeches of Ceylon. i. 44.
Legislation, incautious, since the passing of the Reform Bill, i. 300. *note.*
Letters to the Electors on the Catholic Question, ii. 223—241.
Letters on the Catholics by Peter Plymley, ii. 135—183; on the Ecclesiastical Commission, 254—297; on American Debts, 325—332; on "Locking in upon Railways," 321.
Lettres sur l'Angleterre, review of M. Flevée's, i. 34—37.
Lewis, Matthew, review of his tragedy of Alfonso, i. 15.
Lewis XIV., anecdote of, i. 69.
Lewis XVI., on the execution of, i. 160; Fox's declarations on the execution of, 209, 210.
Liberty and licentiousness of the press, ii. 70.
Licenses for watches in America, i. 288; number that would be required in England, 289.
Limerick, treaty of, i. 129; violated, ii. 125.
Lincoln, Bishop of, review of the charge delivered by (1812), i. 219—224; his pamphlet on the church question, ii. 281. 285.
Linnæus, his secret of infecting oysters, i. 42.
Lister, Mr., review of his novel of Granby, ii. 84.
Literature, advantages to women of cultivating, i. 177—185; among the Americans, 247.
London, Bishop of, his government, ii. 266. 286; his injustice to the Chapter of St. Paul's, 267. 273; his power with the Ecclesiastical Commission, 269. 296; his sharp sayings, 279; his industry, 270; his real motives and wishes, 276; his large income, 296; his charge; his Æschylus, 296; his character, 303.
Longevity of the Norwegians, i. 59.
Lords, House of. *See* House of Lords,
Lotteries in pearl oysters, i. 42.
Lovat, Lord, his appeal to be allowed counsel, ii. 112.
Lunatic asylums, improved method in their management, i. 228; classification of their patients, 231; how managed by the Society of Friends, 233.
Lynch-law, excuse for it, ii. 48.
Lyndhurst, Lord, ii. 281.

M.

Macdowal, General, his treatment and character, i. 123—201.
Mackintosh, Sir James, his panegyric on Charles James Fox, i. 149; letter on his character, ii. 302—305.
Macquarrie, Governor, charges against, ii. 12, 13. 24.
Mad Quakers, i. 228—233.
Madras, review of Narrative of the Disturbances at, i. 191—201.
Magistrates, large powers entrusted to them under the Poor Laws, i. 300; their power to order relief under the Poor Laws should be abolished, 300.
Mahometans in India, not converts from Hindooism, i. 117.

Mahratta Camp, Letters from a, i. 225 — 228.
Mahrattas, devastation caused by, i. 226; their barbarous justice, 227; anecdote of a female soldier of, 227.
Malays, their character, i. 39.
Malthus, Mr., tribute to his memory, i. 8. *note.*
Mammon, its effect upon religion, ii. 258.
Manners, French, sketch of, i. 234.
Manufactures of—America, i. 240; Ashantee, 284; Australia, i. 31; Denmark, 60.
Map of England, ecclesiastical, i. 133.
Margaret, founder of the monarchy of Denmark, i. 51.
Marriage in Denmark, i. 57.
Marriage Bill, opposition to the Dissenters', ii. 43.
Marsden. Rev. Mr., ii. 14; his bearing towards convicts, 16.
Marsh, Bishop. *See* Peterborough, Bishop of.
Martineau, Miss, allusion, to, i. 180.
Mary, Queen, her persecutions, ii. 237.
Massacre at Jaffa, evidence of, examined, i. 64, 65.
Medical men, their courage, i. 66.
Melbourne, Viscount, his character, ii. 278.
Metayers in Denmark, i. 56.
Methodism drives many to insanity, i. 99; review of Mr. Ingram's book on the Causes of the Increase of, 87—101; review of Mr. Styles's defence of, 138—146.
Methodistical reasoning on the interference of Providence, i. 89. 101.
Methodists, terms by which they designate themselves, i. 93; their influence and activity, 95; magnitude of their collections, 95; their missionaries, 96; party for them in the House of Commons and the India House, 97; proselytism their great object, 97; their objections to amusements. 98; their difference from the Established Church, 99; their religious language, 99; their doctrine of theocracy, 99; proofs of miracles claimed by them, 89—101; their perversion of miracles, 144; their war against the orthodox clergy, 140; their complaint of intolerance, 143; their pillage of the earnings of the poor, 140.
Metropolis, Police of the, reference to, i. 48.
Middlemen, the standing grievance of Ireland, i. 309, 310. 314.
Milbank Penitentiary, i. 337.
Ministers, their duty towards an obstinate monarch, ii. 151.
Minorities almost always in the right, i. 360.
Miracles, improper reasoning upon them, i. 14; proofs of, claimed by the Methodists, 89—101; Methodists' perversion of them, 144.
Misanthropy, warning against, ii. 194.
Misgovernment of Ireland, i. 304. 313.
Mission to the Ashantees, i. 280.
Missionaries, opposed by the Brahmans, i. 114; in Ceylon, their success, 117.
Missionary proceedings in Bengal, i. 106—120.
Missionary Society, its missions, i. 104 — 114.
Missions among the Methodists, i. 96; in India, 102—120.
Modern Changes, Letter on, ii. 332.
Modern sermons, their character, i. 5.
Monarch, an obstinate, duty of ministers towards, ii. 151.
Monk, Bishop. *See* Gloucester, Bishop of.
Monk, Gen., his conduct at the Restoration, i. 161; his character, 210. 212.
Moore, Thomas, review of his Memoirs of Captain Rock, ii. 52—52.
Moral sense, its effects on governments, i. 11.
More, Mrs. Hannah, review of her work on Cœlebs in search of a Wife, i. 146—149.
Motives of Men, how influenced, i. 223.
Munro, Colonel, his conduct at Madras, i. 192—201.
Murray, Lady, review of her Narrative of the Adventures of Sir P. Hume, i. 165. 166.
Murray, C. K., his letter to the "Times," ii. 281.
Musk-rat, account of the, i. 44.
Mussulmans of India not converts from the Hindoo faith, i. 117.
Mutiny at Vellore, i. 102; at Nundydrook, 102.

N.

Napoleon. *See* Buonaparte.
Nares, Archdeacon, review of his Sermon of Thanksgiving for Plenty, and warning against Avarice, i. 13—16.
National funds, project for supporting the poor from, i. 293.
Natural children in Denmark, i. 57.
Nature, Darwin's Law of, i. 42.
Necker, M., review of his Dernières Vues de Politique et de Finance, i. 17—26; his plan of a Republic, 21.
Nelson, Lord, notice of Dr. Rennel's Sermon on his Victory, i. 8.
New Holland, pamphlet by the Hon. Grey Bennet upon, i. 270; anticipations of, as a colony, 28; paucity of numbers in, 29.
New South Wales, review of Collins's Account of, i. 26—34; experiment upon human nature in, 29; its climate, 260; its progress, 261; its schools and public lands, 263; courtly appellations given to new discoveries in, 265; diminution of its resources by subordinate settlements, 266; ignorance and tyranny of its governors, 266; sale of spirits in, 267; its import and export duties, 268; its restrictions on navigation, 269; its cost as a school for criminals, 270; no dread inspired by it, 270; profligacy of its morals, 271; advantages of emigrating thither, 271; Wentworth's Description of, reviewed, 260—271; Bennet's account of the colonies in, 270, 271; O'Hara's History of, 272; Mr. Bigge's Report on the Colony of, ii. 12—24; value of distilleries in, 21; trial by jury, unfitted for, 24.
New York, its increase, i. 240.
Nicol, Mr., on the Poor-Laws, review of, i. 293.
Nobility—of Denmark, classes of, i. 54; of Norway, 55; of Holstein, 55.
Non-residence of clergy, i. 49.
Noodle's Oration, ii. 72.
Norfolk Island, its condition, i. 31. 33.
North America, review of Hodgson's Letters from, ii. 42—52.
Norway, description of, i. 53—62; its nobility, 55; Jews prohibited from entering it, 61. *note.*
Norweglans, their longevity, 59.
Nugent, Lord, review of his Statement in support of the Catholic claims, ii. 120—128.
Nundydroog, mutiny at, i. 102.
Nunneries, Protestant, in Denmark, i. 54, 55.

O.

Oath, continuity of laws by, ii. 63; coronation, its binding nature, 64; scruples to Catholic emancipation on account of it, 64; royal scruples upon it, i. 152.
Obstinacy in a juryman, illustration of, ii. 209.
O'Connell, Daniel, ii. 231. 237; his conduct about Repeal, 334; his trial and release, 384; much virtue and good meaning in him, 335;

appeal to him, 335; his readiness to provoke a national war, 336.
Old age, not a good plea for poor-law relief, i. 300; importance communicated to it by knowledge, 184.
Opinion, public, its powers, i. 54; its versatility in France, 24; execution of laws must in great measure depend upon it, ii. 107.
Options, property in, held by the Archbishop of Canterbury, ii. 263.
Orangemen in Ireland, ii. 147; their position, 168.
Ordeal, trial by, among native Africans, i. 74.
Order displayed in Lancaster's schools, i. 79.
Ordination, Bishop Marsh's questions to candidates, ii. 2; recommendations of Archbishop Wake regarding, 6; Lambeth Articles of Archbishop Laud upon, 5.
Ornithorhynchus, description of, i. 261.
Orthodoxy, sacrifices to the genius of, ii. 3; inconveniences of different standards of, 3.
Overseers, office of, i. 299.
Owen, Rev. Mr., quotation from, on reducing Providence to an alternative, i. 120.
Oxford University, Dr. Parr's defence of, i. 4; its imputation against the Catholics, ii. 155.
Oysters, Linnæus's secret of infecting, i. 42; pearl, account of, 42; lotteries in, 42.

P.

Palestine, Travels from, review of, i. 85—87.
Palmer, Mr., review of the Travels of, in America, i. 239—250.
Panegyrics, review of, on C. J. Fox, i. 154—166.
Paper money in Denmark, i. 58.
Papists, their treatment in Ireland, i. 305., ii. 57, 58; their disabilities, i. 305.
Parliament, clergy unrepresented in, i. 231; a colonial, 269.
Parnel, Henry, review of his History of the Penal Laws against the Irish Catholics, i. 127—131.
Parnell, William, review of his Historical Apology for the Irish Catholics, i. 80—84.
Parr, Dr., review of his Spital Sermon, i. 1—5; his learning and character, 4; reason of the neglect of, 5; his eulogomania, 4; his panegyric on Fox, 149; review of his "Characters" of Fox, 149—153.
Partington, Mrs., illustrative of the Lords' attempt to stop the Reform Bill, ii. 214.
Patronage, government cannot be carried on without it, ii. 277.
Paul, St., his answer to Felix, i. 128.
Peace Societies deserving every encouragement, i. 228.
Pearl fishery, account of it, i. 42.
Peasantry of Ireland, demoralised, i. 329.
Peel, Sir R., encomium on, ii. 105; approval of his course against O'Connell, 334; must attempt the payment of the Catholic priests, 338.
Peers, House of, suggestions regarding it, ii. 23.
Penal laws against the Catholics, i. 129, 130.
Pennsylvania, her refusal to pay her debts, ii. 326; no conduct ever more profligate than hers, 327; her debt and finances, 328; position abroad of her citizens, 329; final appeal to her, 330; reply to excuses, for her non-payment, 332.
Penny-post scheme nonsensical, ii. 207.
Perceval, Rt. Hon. Spencer, review of a letter to, on the Curates' Salary Bill, i. 121—127; his zeal for the Protestant interest, ii. 135; his fears, 140; his character, 142; his government, 143.
Percival, Robert, review of his Account of Ceylon, i. 37—44.
Persecuting Bishops, ii. 1—12.
Persecution, nature of, ii. 141; by Henry VIII., Mary, and Elizabeth, 237; how exercised against the Catholics, i. 220, of Catholics by Protestants, ii. 238, 239.
Pessimism, Fievée's approach to, i. 36.
Peter Plymley's Letters, ii. 135—183.
Peterborough, Bishop of, his Ordination Questions, ii. 2; his good intentions, 2; inconveniences of his adopting a different standard from other bishops, 2; danger to the Church of his proceedings, 3; Mr. Thurtell's letter to him, 4; his unequal bearing upon curates and upon rectors, 6; his boast of the paucity of the curates he had excluded, 7; his style, 7; his complaints, 11; his indiscretion, 11.
Pétion, M., his knowledge of our law, i. 35.
Petition—in favour of the Catholics, ii. 201; to Congress, 198.
Petrie, Wm., review of his Statement of Facts delivered to Lord Minto, i. 191—201.
Philadelphia, its progress, i. 240.
Phillips, Richard, review of his Public Characters (1801, 1802), i. 13.
Philopatris Varvicensis, review of his work on C. J. Fox, i. 149—154.
Piety, what kind of, the world hates, i. 141.
Pilgrims, conduct of the Saracens to them, i. 85.
Pitt, Mr., defect in his administration, i. 26.
Plague, description of the, i. 319; its symptoms and cure, 66; curious fact regarding it, 66.
Plays, defence of, i. 147.
Ploughing, picture of, in Ireland, i. 313.
Ploughman, description of a, i. 302. 313.
Plurality and Residence Bill, ii. 287. *et seq.*
Poaching, i. 255—259; remarks on the punishment of, 325. 329.
Poets, the greatest, not educated at public schools, i. 188; bounty of nature in the supply of, 225.
Poisoning at Jaffa, evidence of, examined, i. 66.
Police of the Metropolis, Mr. Colquhoun's, i. 48.
Poor (the), education of, i. 101; interference with their amusements, 136. 140; what respect due to, 140; their unequal treatment for damages to property, 93; project of supporting them from the national funds, 293; overseers of, 293; merit as a test of relief to, 293; project for separating their children, 293; their resort to alehouses, 293; their treatment in removals under the law of settlement, 299; relief of, 299; description of the agricultural, 302; stupid character of writings intended for them, 359.
Poor-Law Bill of Sir J. Scarlett reviewed, i. 348—353.
Poor-Law relief, old age not a good plea for, i. 300.
Poor-Laws (the), i. 293—304; the nucleus of Chartism, 296; Mr. Davison's Considerations on them, 360; freedom from, in America, ii. 45; increase of population under the old, 293. 295; review of Mr. Nicol on, 293; encourage beggary, 349; absurd projects for amending them, 293; their extension to personal property, 293; Mr. Nicol's objections to them, 293; their ultimate but very gradual abolition, 295; law expenses of, 298; true reason for abolishing, 304; amendment of, 348; maximum rate of, 348; cannot be abo-

lished in less than two centuries, 352; their great evils. 353.
Poor-rate, Mr. Davison's plan for its limitation, i. 300; the fixing of a maximum of, 348; litigation arising out of, 350; its gradual extinction, 352.
Pope (the), delusion respecting his power and influence, ii. 135; his alleged right to interfere in temporal concerns, 139; his power to dethrone kings denied, ii. 95; terror of, 179; no law to prevent our entering into diplomatic engagements with him, 538.
Pope of Ireland, Dr. Doyle the, i. 259.
Population, its increase under erroneous administration of Poor-Laws, i. 293. 295; excess of, 302; of Australia, 31; of America, 240. 246; of Ashantee, 283; of Denmark, 58.
Population tumours, i. 297.
Port Jackson described, i. 260.
Portuguese in India, their character, i. 273.
Post-office of the United States, i. 288; of England, 290.
Potatoes one cause of the wretched condition of Ireland, i. 111.
Poverty, infamous in England, ii. 258.
Power, tendency of those entrusted with, i. 292.
Prayer on the birth of the Duke of Cornwall, ii. 254.
Prebendaries, how they should have been reformed, ii. 256; new ones created, 259. 284. 300; patronage belonging to, should be compensated for, 262; distinction between resident and non-resident, 275, 276, 277; management of their estates, 276. 284; considered in a politico-economical view, 275. 284. 292; no public feeling calling for their destruction, 277; their incomes, 300.
Presentations can be sold by laymen or by ecclesiastical corporations, 264.
Preserving of game, i. 253.
Press (the), its liberty and licentiousness, ii. 70; its power would be lessened by the reform of parliament, 219.
Priests, Catholic, in Ireland, their dependence on their flocks, i. 306.
Prison Discipline, Society for its Improvement, i. 353. 361., ii. 21; may be over estimated, 40; note on Mr. Roscoe's opinions on, 41, 42.
Prison labour, review of Mr. Headlam's work on, ii. 34—41.
Prisons, Buxton's efforts for their improvement, i. 330; his book on this subject, 337; review of Mr. Holford's work on, 337; Mr. Gurney on, 336; review of Mr. Western's work on, 356—365; the small number of recommitments to, no test of amelioration, 354; principal objects of, 354; solitary confinement in them, 356; too great indulgence in them, 356; what life in them should be, 358; diet in them, 332. 360; corporal punishment in, 361: improvement in, on the Continent, 361; persons detained in, after acquittal, 364; the greatest improvement in them would be a jail delivery four times a year, 365; private, ii. 55; their state in England, 330—340.
Prisoners, treatment of, before and after trial, 331; their classification, 332; their solitary confinement, 332. 356; gradations of their punishment, 334; their reformation, 334; their earnings, 335; comforts allowed to them, 336; female, 338; injustice of preventing their defence by counsel, 339; charitable aid to them for expenses of procuring their witnesses, 339: their cruel treatment before trial, ii. 32; cruelty and tyranny involved in their labour, 38. 45; cruelty and absurdity of denying them counsel, 43—46; should be liberated immediately after acquittal, i. 361; not to be treated before trial as paupers, 365; prevalent feeling concerning them, ii. 41; petition from jurymen for allowing counsel to them, 106; obstacles to their obtaining evidence in defence, 107; often convicted when innocent, 108. 122; authorities for allowing counsel to them when accused of felony, 109; plan for giving them an option of having counsel, 118.
Proclamation relative to the mutiny at Vellore, i. 102.
Procrastinator, fallacy of his argument, ii. 69.
Property, rights of, when abused, ii. 305; personal, proposed to be subjected to poor-rates, i. 293; of every man in the game upon his land, 252.
Proselytism the great object of the Methodists, i. 97.
Protestant Church benefited by Catholic emancipation, ii. 177. 227. 230; upon what security founded, i. 222.
Protestant nunneries in Denmark, i. 54.
Protestants in Ireland, their bigotry and party spirit, i. 304; their proportion to the Catholics, 305, 306.
Providence, Archdeacon Nares's erroneous reasoning on, i. 14; the notion of its immediate interference natural, 74; Methodistical reasoning on its interference, 88—101; charged by the Rev. Mr. Owen with being reduced to an alternative, 123; on the special interference of, 140.
Public Characters of 1801, 1802, review of Phillips's book on the, i. 13.
Public opinion. *See* Opinion.
Public principle, importance of, i. 190, 191.
Public schools. *See* Schools.
Pulpit eloquence, remarks on, i. 5.
Punishment, the philosophy of, i. 325. 329; its gradations, 334; its first object, 334. 339; its duration should be lessened and severity increased, 339; its proper maximum, ii. 29; capital, 42; boast of the Emperor of Hayti on, 7.
Punishments, tyrannical, for infringement of the game laws, i. 259.
Purra Society in Africa, i. 35.

Q.

Quakers in Denmark, i. 61; review of Tuke's Description of an Institution for Insane, 228—234.
Qualifications for shooting game, their abolition recommended, i. 252—254.
Quantities, false, i. 280.
Queen, Sermon on the Duties of the, ii. 24—253; anticipated happiness of her reign, 2 3; scene at her coronation, 279.
Quietist, his fallacy, ii. 69.

R.

Radicals, their admission of the lawful influence of wealth and power, ii. 307; the two varieties of them, 307; their advocacy of the ballot, 310—316; their desire for universal suffrage, 315.
Railways, Letters on "locking in" upon, ii. 321.
Randolph, John, his opinion of the ballot, ii. 314.
Rapp, founder of the Harmonites, ii. 51.
Rate, labour. *See* Labour-rate.
Rate, poor. *See* Poor-rate.

Rectors, incomes of, i. 124.
Redesdale, Lord, his mistakes about the Catholics, ii. 180.
Refinement among barbarous tribes, i. 73.
Reform of the Church, absolutely necessary, ii. 256; should be accompanied by compensation for existing interests, 261; terror it had inspired, 258. 268. 273. 275. 277. 294; might have been effected in a less revolutionary manner, 273. 287. 298; unwise course of the radicals regarding it, 277. 279; declaration of Viscount Melbourne upon, 277; opportunity for, through the Cathedral Chapters, 231; government plan of, 283.
Reform in the processes of law, i. 243.
Reform of the game laws, ii. 79.
Reform, parliamentary, speech upon, at Taunton, ii. 207; subsequent note upon, 208; considered the cure of every evil, 210; would destroy the trade of agitation, 210; would lessen the power of the press, 219; danger of delaying it, 213, 214. 219; impossibility of ultimately defeating it, 214. 215. 223; precedents for it, 215; practical improvements anticipated from it, 218; foolish expectations entertained from it, 228.
Reform Bill, state of England previous to it, ii. 216; Mrs. Partington illustrative of the Lords' attempt to stop it, 214; not final, but should allow time for breathing after it, 310; rapid and incautious legislation since the passing of it, i. 300. *note*.
Reformation, the Protestant, ii. 215. 242.
Regicides, French and English, contrasted, i. 161.
"Regulators," described, ii. 48.
Religion, the first scaffolding of, i. 77; sentiment of, has always a tendency to moderation, 88; of the Hindoos, 118; familiarity on the subjects of, 148; effect of Mammon on, 606. 639; in America, 247.
Religious toleration in Denmark, i. 61.
Removals, hardship of, under the Settlement Laws, i. 299.
Rennel, Dr., review of his Discourses on Various Subjects, i. 5—10; faults of, 8; allusion to, 9. 13.
Rent, when too high, the ruin of the land and the tenant, i. 309, 310.
Repeal, civil war would be preferable to it, ii. 334, 335.
Republic, review of M. Necker's plan of a, i. 21, unsuited for France, 24.
Residence of the clergy, review of Dr. Sturge's Thoughts on, i. 48—50; may be too hardly exacted, 127; of the aristocracy on their estates, ii. 28.
Restoration, conduct of Monk at the, i. 161.
Retribution, arguments for a future state of, i. 98.
Revenue of Denmark; of the United States, i. 288.
Reviews, one great use of, ii. 59.
Revolution, French, i. 8; Danish, 53—56; French, emulates the English, 160; created by the Ecclesiastical Commission, ii. 256; of 1688, 215.
Rewards and punishments in Lancaster's institution, i. 78.
Rich, their amusements, i. 252—255.
Ridicule, use of the fear of, in education, i. 78; use of, as a weapon excusable, 139.
Rock, Captain, Memoirs of, reviewed, ii. 52—59.
Roman Catholics. *See* Catholics.
Roscoe, Mr., note on his opinions on prison discipline, ii. 42.
Rose, Rt. Hon. George, review of his observations on the historical work of C. J. Fox, i. 154—166; his animadversions on it, 207—218.
Roundsman, description of a, 309.
Rousseau, Jean Jacques, anecdotes of, i. 237.
Russell, Lord John, Letter to, ii. 297—301; his complaint against the Chapters, 272; his conduct towards cathedral property, 276; the Lycurgus of the Lower House, 278; his importance in the administration, 281; his conduct towards the Ecclesiastical Commission, 283. 286; his character, 286. 301; his language on the ballot, 314; unjust opinion held of him, 315; his line of duty clearly marked out, 315.
Russia, Emperor of, Madame de Staël's compliment to, ii. 65.
Russian ambassador, anecdote of the, ii. 171.

S.

Saadi, the Persian poet, ii. 248.
Sacrifices to the Genius of Orthodoxy, ii. 3; human, in Ashantee, 283.
Sale of game, i. 252. 255—259.
Salic law, note on, i. 23.
Sand, plants which grow in, i. 52.
Saracens, their conduct to pilgrims, i. 85.
Saturday Night, the Bishops', ii. 284.
Savage life, evils of, i. 27.
Scarlett, Sir James, review of his Poor-law Bill, i. 348—353; encomium on, 353.
Schoolmasters, being ministers, should be exempt from residence, i. 50.
Schools, public, system of education in, i. 186—191; no cure for the insolence of the youthful aristocracy, 186; unimportance of athletic exercises in, 187; the most eminent men in science, the arts, literature, or belles lettres, have not been educated at, 188; not favourable to the cultivation of knowledge, 190; morality at, 190; in New South Wales, 262.
Scindia, character of, i. 225.
Scotland, conduct and example of, ii. 148.
Scott, Sir William, his speech on the non-residence of clergy, i. 49.
Secretary, Colonial, excuse for his misconduct, i. 260.
Sect, impossible to arrive at a knowledge of a, through merely their articles of belief, i. 88.
Self-trumpeting, fallacy of, ii. 65.
Sermons, modern characteristics of, i. 5; preached at Bristol, ii. 242—248; at St. Paul's, 249—253; before the Judges at York, 184—189. 191—196.
Serpent, anecdote of a, i. 44.
Settlement, law of, i. 348; its evils, 296; an inexhaustible source of litigation, 298; hardship of removals of it, 299.
Seybert's work on America, review of, i. 286—290.
Shooter's Guide, by Johnson, i. 323.
Shopkeepers, combinations against them by their customers on account of political opinions, ii. 305. 312; greater hardship which they would endure, if suspected, under the ballot system, 313.
Sidmouth, Lord, his proceedings in regard to the Toleration Act, i. 201—207.
Sierra Leone, review of Dr. Winterbottom's Account of, i. 71—75.
Singleton, Archdeacon, letters to, ii. 255.
Slavery, in Denmark, i. 56; compensation for abolishing, ii. 261; in America, i. 248, 249. ii. 52; in Ashantee, 282.
Slaves, their increase in the United States, i. 248, 249; their proportion to the free, 292.
Slave trade (the), the foulest blot in the

morality of Europe, i. 60; the Danes the first to abolish it, 60; in Ashantee, 40.
Sleswick, nature of its soil, i. 53; its nobility, 55.
Sloth, habits of the, ii. 79.
Smith, Rev. Sydney, his promotion in the Church, ii. 273. 295; his political career, 274; his treatment by the Whigs, 274; attacked by the Bishop of Gloucester, 295; his reviews, 295; his consistency, 300; his last as well as earliest efforts exerted for the promotion of religious freedom, 334.
Smuggling, i. 258; in Jersey, reason why it was so long in being put down, ii. 219.
Snakes, of Ceylon, i. 44; habits of, ii. 78. 80.
Society — for the improvement of Prison Discipline, encomium on, i. 353. 361; for superseding the necessity of Climbing Boys, its proceedings, 272—279; for the Suppression of Vice, ii. 143; its proceedings, i. 131—138.
Societies — for Converting the Heathen, i. 104; Peace, deserving encouragement, 228.
Solitary confinement, i. 332—356.
Somerville, Mrs., allusion to, i. 180.
South America, review of Waterton's Wanderings in, ii. 74—84.
Sovereigns, power of the Pope to dethrone, denied, i. 224.
Speeches, ii. 197—222.
Spirits, sale of, in New South Wales, i. 267, 268; duty on, in America, 288.
Spital Sermon, review of Dr. Parr's, i. 1. 5.
Spring-guns, illegality of their use argued, i. 322—330. 340—348.
Staël, Madame de, review of her Delphine, i. 44—48; Napoleon's treatment of her, 44; her description of Talleyrand, 46; her compliment to the Emperor of Russia, ii. 65.
Stafford, Lord, his conviction, ii. 119.
Statistical annals of the United States, by Seybert, i. 286—290.
Stockton, review of his work on allowing Counsel for Prisoners, ii. 106.
Strafford, Lord, on the execution of, i. 159.
Struensee, notice of, i. 51.
Sturges, Dr., review of his work on the Residence of the Clergy, i. 48—50.
Styles, Mr., review of his work in defence of Methodism, i. 138—146.
Suffering not a merit of itself, i. 142.
Suffrage, universal. *See* Universal Suffrage.
Sunday, its observance not to be effected by main force, i. 134.
Supremacy of the king, a mere name, ii. 132; oath of, dispensed with, 177.
Surprise the essence of wit, i. 70.
Surveys, elaborate, their importance, i. 63.
Sweden, notice of, i. 51.
Sydney, New South Wales, i. 262; oversight in the building of, 266; folly of ornamental architecture in, ii. 12.

T.

Tabernacle (the), its relation to the Church, i. 100.
Tableau des Etats Danois, by Catteau, review of, i. 50—63.
Talipot tree of Ceylon, i. 44.
Talleyrand, Madame de Staël's description of, i. 46.
Taunton, speech at, on the Reform Bill, ii. 207.
Taxation in New South Wales, i. 268.
Taxes, freedom from, in America, ii. 49; on furniture in America, i. 288; enumeration of, in England, 291.
Taylor, Jeremy, his eloquence, i. 5.
Tenants, dismissal of, on account of their votes at elections, ii. 305; their general indifference to politics, 306, 307; ballot would be no protection to them against an oppressive landlord, 311; their rejection for their opinions, 307. 313.
Thanksgiving Sermon of Archdeacon Nares, review of, i. 13—15:
Theocracy, doctrine of, among the Methodists, i. 97.
Theological errors not cognisable by Government, ii. 136.
Theory, fallacy of the imputation of, ii. 71.
Thurtell, Mr., his letter to the Bishop of Peterborough, ii. 4.
Tithes, their operation in Ireland, i. 306, 307; must be relaxed in Ireland, ii. 151. 173.
Titles, love of the Americans for, i. 244.
Tippoo, his religious persecution of the Hindoos, i. 144.
"Times," letter to the Editor of the, ii. 281.
Toleration, religious, i. 201, 202; ii. 167; security afforded to the Church by, 223; in America, 43; in Denmark, i. 61.
Tomlin, Bishop. *See* Lincoln, Bishop of.
Tortoise, habits of the, ii. 80.
Torture, the application of, i. 217.
Tory Lords, appeal to them, ii. 122; their excuses, 122.
Toucan, account of the, ii. 78.
Transportation, objections to, i. 27, 28; cruelty and neglect in the first conduct of, 270; injustice towards persons sentenced to, for limited periods, 271; difference of offences under, ii. 14; scanty limits allowed to convicts during, 21; its enormous expense when efficiently conducted, 24.
Travel, value of books of, i. 34.
Travellers, faults of, i. 35.
Travels in Turkey, Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt, by Dr. Wittman, review of, i. 64—68; of Bertrandon de la Brocquière, review of, 85—87; of Waterton in South America, review of, ii. 74—84.
Tread-mill, irksome and disgusting labour of it, ii. 35; its consequences as a punishment, 37; its expensiveness, 40.
Treaty of Limerick, i. 129; violation of it, ii. 126.
Trial by jury in New South Wales, i. 269; unfitted for that colony, ii. 23.
Tribunals of Conciliation in Denmark, i. 55.
Trimmer, Mrs., review of her book on Lancaster's new Plan of Education, i. 75—80.
Tropical climates, insects the great curse in, ii. 81.
Trust, all government is a, ii. 267.
Tuke, Samuel, review of his work on the Treatment of the Insane, i. 228—234.
Turgot, M., his objections to all charitable institutions combated, i. 3.
Turkey, Dr. Wittman's Travels in, i. 64—68; Janissaries of, 67; indiscipline of its army, 67; reforms in, 68; its Grand Vizier, 68; condition of, 316; custom in, towards fraudulent bakers, ii. 114.
Turkish camp, horrors of, i. 66; contrast of, in 1800 and in the 16th century, 67.
Turks (the) represented by Bertrandon as a gay laughing people, i. 87.

U.

Ultimatum, no other in government than perfect justice, i. 138.
Union with Ireland, opposition to, ii. 149.
Unitarians, no expense to the state, ii. 129; their opinions, 130.

Universal benevolence, a principle of ethics, i. 3.
Universal suffrage the inevitable consequence of the ballot, ii. 316; great and dangerous changes it would introduce, 318; its inexpediency, 318.
Universities of Copenhagen, i. 62; their reputation always shortlived, 62; English, defective system of education at, 172—174.
University of Oxford, Dr. Parr's defence of, i. 4; its imputation on the Irish Catholics, 49.

V.

Vampires, habits of, i. 80.
Van Diemen's Land, its settlement, i. 266.
Vellore, insurrection at, i. 102.
Veterinary Schools, established in Denmark earlier than in Great Britain, i. 59.
Vice, true way of attacking it, i. 184; Society for the Suppression of, 131—138; ii. 143.
Vindication of Fox's History, review of Serj. Heywood's, i. 207—218.
Voltaire, account of, i. 238.
Voting. *See* Ballot.

W.

Wallace, Mr., ii. 288.
Wanderings in South America, &c., by Waterton, review of, ii. 74—84.
War, picture of its horrors, i. 228; Englishmen who in modern times have evinced a genius for it, 188; almost as natural to mankind as peace, ii. 127. 203. 233; its effects on American commerce, i. 287—291.
Warburton, Mr., ii. 207, *note*.
Watches, licences for using, in America, i. 288; number that would be required in England.
Waterton, Chas., review of his Wanderings in South America, ii. 74—84; his style, 75; his frontispiece picture, 79; his feats, 81, 82; his adventures with a crocodile, 82; customs' dues exacted on his Collection, 83.
Wellington, Duke of, ii. 281; his sagacity in choosing a good position, 318.
Wesley, John, his conduct, i. 100.
Western, Mr, review of his work on Prisons i. 356—365.
"What shall I do to inherit eternal life?" ii. 191—196.
Whigs, merit due to them for the patronage bestowed on Catholics, ii. 187; encomium on them, 207; their faults, 208; their measures, 274.
Whitelaw's History of Dublin, i. 304.
Whitfield, notice of, i. 100.
Wilberforce, Mr., head of the patent Christians of Clapham, ii. 146. 179.
Wentworth's Description of New South Wales, review of, i. 260—272.
William IV. saved England from a revolution, ii. 208. 218; his honourable conduct, 212. 222; his popularity, 221; sermon on his death, 249.
Winds (the), the unsubsidised allies of England, ii. 149. 157. 164.
Winterbottom, Dr., review of his Account of Sierra Leone, i. 75.
"Wisdom of our ancestors," mischievousness of the cry, ii. 60; much of it mere jealousy and envy, 156; the usual topic in defending the folly of their descendants, i. 84.
Wit, the pleasure arising from, compared with that arising from bulls, i. 69; surprise the essence of, 70; impaired or destroyed when mingled with much thought or passion, 71.
Witchcraft in Ashantee, i. 282.
Wittman, Dr., review of his travels, i. 64—69; his heroism, 66.
Women, alleged disadvantages of knowledge in, i. 176, 177; may be trained to reason and imagine as well as men, 183; their education very defective, 175—185; dotation of, in New South Wales, 29; French, their love of intrigue, 234.
World, proper method of preparing the young for it, i. 98.
Wourali poison, ii. 76.

Y.

Yeomanry, folly of putting them down, ii. 207, *note*.
York, sermons preached at, ii. 184—196.

THE END.

LONDON
PRINTED BY SPOTTISWOODE AND CO.
NEW-STREET SQUARE

University of California
SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
405 Hilgard Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90024-1388
Return this material to the library
from which it was borrowed.

JAN 23 1998
REC'D LD-URL
JAN 13 2003
DEC 10 1997
SEP 26 02

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
A 000 145 852 0

Uni
S